

THE
GOSPEL OF THE JUBILEE.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE TYPICAL PRIVILEGES SECURED
TO THE CONGREGATION AND PIOUS STRANGERS, BY
THE ATONEMENT ON THE MORNING OF THE
JUBILEE.—*Lev. XXV, 9-46.*

BY SAMUEL CROTHERS,

PASTOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN GREENFIELD,
HIGHLAND CO., OHIO.

RE-PRINT FROM THE AUTHOR'S EDITION OF 1839.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION
BY REV. JOHN RANKIN.

CINCINNATI:
AMERICAN REFORM TRACT AND BOOK SOCIETY.
1856.

C.

Gift of
Rev. M. M. Songley

12178

INTRODUCTION.

I AM happy in knowing that the AMERICAN REFORM TRACT AND BOOK SOCIETY design to republish and rescue this excellent work from that oblivion into which it has been liable to fall, and to give it that extended circulation which it justly deserves. For originality and strength of thought it has a very high degree of merit, while at the same time it presents the Old Testament Scriptures and dispensation in a true and glorious light. It may truly be said to be one of the best books of the age.

Some years have elapsed since it was written, and important changes have taken place, yet it is deemed expedient and right to let the author still speak what were then his sentiments and feelings. Great injustice is often done to authors by revising and altering their works.

While the American Reform Tract and Book Society claim the right of determining what books they will publish, and will publish none but such

as they deem good and useful, yet, when they do publish a book, they will let the author speak his own sentiments in his own words. It is, therefore, to be understood, that they do not hold themselves responsible for every expression an author may use. There are no infallible authors except those inspired, and there are no infallible examining committees. Books should come forth to the world in their native dress and original strength. Expurgating committees are liable to purge out the strength and vitality of the book undertaken to amend.

JOHN RANKIN.

THE GOSPEL OF THE JUBILEE.

"THEN shalt thou cause the trumpet of the Jubilee to sound, on the tenth day of the seventh month in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof," etc., etc.—LEV. xxv, 9, 46.

THE importance of understanding the various means of grace which God has, at different times, appointed in his church, is generally admitted; but we have an additional inducement to study carefully the ordinance of the Jubilee. It has long been shamefully misrepresented and abused. For centuries it has been proclaimed from the pulpit and the press as a divine license for the slave-trade, and a system of slavery which, for injustice and cruelty, has no parallel in the history of the world. It was long quoted in justification of those slavemaking wars which, for ages, desolated Africa. It was used as a passport for

those slavers whose trade all nations are now pronouncing piracy. It is still in the mouth of every slaveholder, for the sake of gain. It has been used by all descriptions of men in all departments of the slavemaking concern. Over fields strewed with the dead bodies of innocent Africans, who had fallen in defense of their wives and children; over slaughtered villages; on the slave farm, and in the slave ship amid all the horrors of the middle passage; in the grog-shop, and in the house of God; at the gaming board, and at the Lord's table; in health, and in the solemn hour of death; it has quieted the consciences of men-stealers, and those who turn aside the stranger from his rights, under the most fearful denunciations of the wrath of God. If those who used the ark of the covenant as a charm to insure success in battle, were guilty of a *horrible thing in Israel*, of how much sorer punishment shall they be thought worthy, who use the means of salvation as panders to their lusts!

Our aim in the following remarks is to show that the Jubilee was intended to exhibit typically the doctrine of the atonement, and some of those important truths connected with it, on

which saved sinners have been living from the beginning. Thus, we hope to make it appear that it affords no more encouragement to slaveholding, or to either the African or American slave-trade, than the Lord's supper, or any other means of grace.

We are aware of the existing prejudices against all attempts to find gospel in the law which God gave his church by Moses. It is admitted that great mischief has been done by fanciful interpretations. If this, however, be a good reason for laying aside any part of the Scriptures, it will be equally good for abandoning the whole. But the rules which the Word of God furnishes for its own interpretation will guide us as safely in the study of the Old Testament as the New.

The inspired interpreters of the Sinai covenant furnish the key to all its mysteries when they declare that it was "our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ;" that it was "the shadow of things to come." The principal reason why we so generally fail in attempting to expound it is, we take it up as we would any book of civil law. We leave out of view its typical character, and thus deprive ourselves of the aid

of New Testament light, on both typical and anti-typical things. Take away the idea that its ordinances were shadows of things to come, and in many instances it will be impossible to point out their wisdom or goodness.

The important inquiry is, How shall we know what things were typical, and what those things are of which they were the types? It no more belongs to us to make types than it does to institute sacraments. The following are some of the rules which God has instituted:

1. In some instances we are expressly told that certain persons and things were types, or shadows, or examples, or figures, of the *true*. Adam, we are told, was the *figure* of Christ. Rom. v, 14. The meats and holy-days, the new moons and Sabbaths, of the ceremonial law, are called *shadows of things to come*. Col. ii, 17. The priests and their offerings, the tabernacle and its furniture, and the various rites observed there, are said to be *examples and shadows of heavenly things*. Heb. viii, 5. Sodom and Gomorrah, and those cities around them which perished under a storm of fire and brimstone, are said to be "set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." Jude vii.

2. Sometimes the analogy between things in the New Testament and things in the old law is so manifest, and there are such allusions to them by inspired writers, as to leave no room for doubting that they are related as type and anti-type. Who can doubt that the land of Canaan was a type of Heaven?

3. *Frequently types and the persons or things of which they were typical are called by the same names.* From the fact that Jesus Christ is called David, our High Priest, our Master, the Lamb of God, the Bread of Life, etc., we are sure that all those persons and things from whom those titles are borrowed were types of him. This *transfer of names* is very frequent, and it is a clear and sure indication of the will of God as to what things are to be considered as types. It is as infallible in its results as any rule in any art or science.

With these and other rules furnished by the Scriptures, there is but little difficulty in ascertaining what was meant by the atonement made on the morning of the Jubilee—the liberty proclaimed throughout all the land—the blowing of the trumpet—the year of rest—the restoration of inheritances—the privilege of buying

servants of the nations round about, etc. We have only to turn to the New Testament by the help of a concordance and marginal reference, to find that in the death and intercession of our Lord, we have the *true* (i. e. the anti-typical) atonement; that the preaching of the Word by the Son of God, or the heralds of his cross, is the blowing of the trumpet; that the liberty, followed by a year of rest, prefigured the release of the servants of Jesus Christ from their master's work on earth, to the enjoyment of rest with him in Heaven; that Heaven is the true inheritance of our elder brother, and of all who are joint heirs with him; and that the privilege which the typical atonement secured to landholders and pious strangers of living together as masters and servants, was the presage of the glorious privilege to be proclaimed, in New Testament times, to the whole Gentile world, of becoming servants of our elder brother Jesus Christ.

1. *The Jubilee was ushered in by the Atonement.*

Few hearers of the gospel need be told that by the work of the high priest, on that morning, in making the annual atonement, the death and

intercession of our great High Priest were pre-figured. They are both called by the same name. The typical expiation always took place on the tenth day of the seventh month—about the third of our October. It was one of the great days in Israel. There was to be an *holy convocation*. It was the only stated fast which the law required. Every soul that did not afflict himself, and abstain from labor as on the Sabbath, was to be cut off. On that day the sins of the people were typically expiated; and the only way in which God can be just in the forgiveness of sin, was clearly exhibited.

To have clear and scriptural views of the way of salvation, and of the blessings typified by the jubilee, it is necessary to attend to the work which the high priest had to perform on that morning: see Lev. xvi. "*He shall make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the congregation, and for the altar, and he shall make an atonement for the priests, and for all the people of the congregation,*" v. 33.

The same work which is here called *making atonement*, is called (verse 20) *reconciling*. Neither *reconciliation* nor *atonement* means a

change of feelings or dispositions. The tabernacle and the altar had no dispositions nor feelings to change. The offending party is, always in Scripture, the one who is said to be reconciled. So our Lord uses the word, Matt. v, 24; and so it is everywhere used. We read of sinners being reconciled to God, but never of God being reconciled to them. The latter, according to the Scripture use of the phrase, would be as absurd as to talk of an atonement being made for the Holy One. Reconciling sinners means *removing the ground of God's controversy with them, by making satisfaction for their sins*. Hence reconciliation is always represented as the work of a priest, to be effected by the application of sacrificial blood.

The only remark we make respecting the atonement for the priest is, the fact that before he reconciled others he needed to be reconciled himself. An inspired expositor notices this as evidence of the imperfection of Aaron's priesthood, and of our need of such an high priest as Jesus, the Son of God, who also became man without being tainted with sin—"holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and

made higher than the Heavens, who needeth not daily as those high priests to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people." That he might be typically what Jesus was truly — without sin — he was to be reconciled with blood, in the same way substantially in which he was to reconcile the congregation.

To understand how a holy God can reconcile us to himself not imputing to us our trespasses, let us attend to the manner in which the high priest reconciled the congregation, the altar, the tabernacle, and the holy sanctuary.

"He shall take the two goats and present them alive before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats, one lot for the Lord and the other for the scape goat. And Aaron shall bring the goat on which the Lord's lot fell, and offer him for a sin offering, but the goat on which the lot fell to be the scape goat, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scape goat into the wilderness." Lev. xvi, 7—10.

That the typical representation might be

complete, two goats were necessary, one to represent the dying, the other the rising Savior, one to be slain, the other to bear away sin.

1. The goat on which the Lord's lot fell was to be killed. It is a fundamental principle in the religion of the Bible, that without shedding of blood there is no remission. In this age of expediency the punishment of sin is represented by many as a mere expedient thing. But the Scriptures teach us that *righteousness and judgment* are the habitation of his throne, that it is the nature of the holy and just God to hate sin; and that such are its demerits that he WILL PUNISH IT, either in the person of the offender, or of his substitute. To ask him to take us into favor with himself without reconciling us, in the scriptural sense of the phrase, is to ask him to become an apostate God. Surely we can not expect him to disregard the claims of his law and justice, when we recollect that it was for disregarding those claims that he has damned angels and men. A religion without an atonement insults the God of Heaven. The design of the typical expiation on the morning of jubilee was, to banish from the minds of all present, the delu-

sion that God either will or can dispense with the punishment of sin ; to proclaim his justice ; and to furnish his church with a pledge that in the fullness of time his own son should take the sinner's place, and die, "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God."

2. *Its body to be burned without the camp.*
—In the epistle to the Hebrews we are referred to this burning for an illustration of the scene on Mount Calvary: "The bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are buried without the camp ; wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." After the altar was fixed at Jerusalem, the valley of Hinnom "by the entry of the east gate" (Jer. xix, 2,) was that place without the camp. It was in that clean place where the ashes were poured out, (Lev. iv, 12,) that the bodies of the sin offering were burnt, until Josiah defiled it for the purpose of putting an end to the worship of Moloch, instituted thereby his idolatrous predecessors. *Fire*, when used in the temple service, always signified the presence and agency of the Holy Spirit in his work of justice

or mercy. When applied to the sacrifice to consume it to ashes, it was the symbol of that wrath which the Holy Spirit was to pour in upon the soul of Messiah when he should become the sacrifice for sin,—of that wrath which shall be the portion of every sinner who dies Christless. Hence *Hell* is called a lake of fire. That valley of Hinnom where there was no interceding priest, no atoning blood, nothing but the blazing fire consuming the body of the sin offering, was the type of Hell. Hence in many of the discourses of our Lord, the word Hell is, in the original, GEHENNA or the land of Hinnom. By an allusion to that valley which is also called TOPHET, the prophet seems to be describing the place of torment. Tophet is ordained of God; yea for the King it is prepared, he hath made it deep and large, the pile thereof is fire and much wood, the breath of the Lord as a stream of brimstone doth kindle it.” There could be no skeptics as to future punishment at the temple, except those who scoff at the whole solemnity. That there is a hell for the finally impenitent, was just as clearly held up to view, as that there is a God in Heaven, for the righteous. That fire

which was seen at a distance by all who stood in any of the courts of the temple, was the symbol of the wrath which awaits despisers of the atonement. The alternative which the Gospel sets before all who hear it is this — either take refuge under the merits of him who bore the wrath of God for sinners, or bear that wrath yourself. The object of the apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews is to prove to them that there is no other alternative. And as the proof that the God of Israel did make promise to believers that his son should offer himself through the eternal spirit, he quotes the fact that those offerings by which the death of Christ was prefigured were BY FIRE. Heb. ix, 14. *

According to the notions entertained by many respecting the *atonement* and *reconciliation*, the work was finished as soon as the high priest had slain the victim, and burnt its body

* That the valley of Hinnom was the type of Hell we know by the fact that they are both called by the same name. The notion that the place of torment is called *Gehenna* and *Tophet* because there, for a while, Moloch was worshiped, and there little children expired in the flames, is absurd. Where is the parallel? Is Hell a place of idolatrous worship? Does it resound with the cries of little infants?

with fire. Had he done nothing more, however, neither the congregation, nor the altar, nor any part of the house of God, would have been reconciled. It was the using of the blood, in the way prescribed in behalf of the person or thing to be reconciled, which made the ATONEMENT. Throughout all the regulations given to the sons of Aaron, in all their sacrifices, this idea is distinctly held up. The mere fact of the death of Christ never reconciled a sinner to God, nor strictly speaking, atoned for the sins of a single individual. When he died he offered the great sacrifice without which there could be no reconciliation. But it is when, as our advocate or intercessor, he applies his blood, or presents it before the father in our behalf, that we are reconciled. Hence the apostle stakes his ability to save on the fact that "he ever liveth to make intercession for us." The man who scoffs at an intercessor, and at all who tell sinners that they must by faith apply to Jesus to intercede for them, while he insists that the mere death of the Savior will take all men to Heaven — is not the advocate of a universal atonement. He is the advocate of a universal salvation without any

atonement at all. When Jesus died on the cross, and thus shed his blood for sinners, the Scriptures represent him as having sacrificed himself with his blood, that he might save them—as having perfected himself through sufferings as the captain of salvation that he might bring many sons unto glory—as having furnished himself with the means of reconciling all who should believe, and of preparing for them mansions in Heaven. When the high priest had slain the goat for sin offering, and had burnt its body with fire, an important part of the work of atonement was finished, but an important part yet remained to be done—the sprinkling of the blood.

3. *He was to make an atonement for the holy sanctuary, and the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar, and the congregation, by sprinkling the blood upon the mercy seat, and upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense, and upon the horns of the altar (of burnt offering) round about.*

The temple as well as the tabernacle which preceded it, consisting of the two apartments separated from each other by the vail, is represented as a type of both Christ and believers.

* But the temple including the court, represented that body of Christ which is composed of Christ and all who are united with him by his spirit, and all who make a credible profession of faith in him. It had three parts—the holy sanctuary, called the holiest of all—the tabernacle of the congregation—and the court before the door of the tabernacle, where the altar for burnt offerings stood. The first represented the church triumphant in Heaven; the second the church militant or all in this world who are savingly united with Christ; the third the visible church, including all who make a credible profession of faith in Christ, with their children. This explains that class of texts which addresses every description of men as having in some sense, yet *to enter into the Kingdom of God*. If you have entered the visible church, or outer court, you must enter into the invisible church, if you would not perish; and when there you have yet to enter into Heaven, the true holiest of all.

The High Priest had the work of reconciliation to perform for all those departments. The same work which reconciled them, at the same time, reconciled the people. It was effected

in substantially the same way in which he made atonement for the whole congregation in case of a sin of ignorance [Levit. iv]; excepting that in the latter, he must "sprinkle the blood seven times before the Lord, before the vail." But on the day of atonement he entered within the vail, and sprinkled it on the mercy seat.

1. *The Holy Sanctuary*.—"Which is called the holiest of all, which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded; and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy seat." That this holy of holies was the type of Heaven, and that the work of the High Priest there was typical of the work of our intercessor in Heaven, is every where taught in the epistle to the Hebrews. Besides the ark and its appurtenances and the censer, it contained no other furniture.

The mercy seat, or propitiation (Gr. *Hilasterion**) which was the golden lid of the ark, was

* Christ is the helasterin [propitiation] to believers only; Rom. iii, 25. But he is the Helasmos [propitiation] or propitiatory sacrificed for the whole world; 1 John ii, 2.

a type of Christ; Rom. iii, 25. In allusion to the precious symbols which it concealed, the apostle speaking of our Savior (its anti-type), says: "In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." It covered these two tables on which were written God's covenant of redemption. "I am the Lord God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage." This was God's written covenant that he would redeem his people from the bondage of sin, in that way, of which their redemption from Egyptian bondage, was both the type and pledge.

On the same tables were written that holy, just, and good law, by the violation of which, all mankind have become sinners; that law, which Jesus had within his heart; Ps. xl, 8; and whose claims he was to satisfy by his obedience and death, that he might save sinners.

It contained a golden pot full of manna, with which Israel were fed in the wilderness; the emblem of the body of Christ, the true bread of life, which was to come down from Heaven; the pledge, that with that living bread every believer should be sustained on his journey to the Heavenly Canaan.

It contained Aaron's rod that budded ; which by its budding, and blooming blossoms, yielding almonds, silenced the murmurs of the rebels, and attested his divine right to the priesthood ; Numb. xvii, 8. At the waving of the rod of Aaron, God's mighty works were wrought in Egypt, and at the Red Sea, and in the wilderness. It was deposited in the ark, as the symbol of the power of the true High Priest and Redeemer, and as the pledge, that his power should be with his church till the end.

Over the mercy seat were the cherubim "with their wings stretched forth on high, with their faces looking one to another toward the mercy seat," expressive of the intense interest with which angels and all holy beings study the mysteries of redemption. Between the cherubim was the cloud of glory, the symbol of the presence of Jehovah. Hence he is called the God that dwells between the cherubim ; Psal. lxxx, 1.

From the mercy seat, oracles were uttered in answer to the inquires of the High Priest with urim and thumim. There God met him, and communed with him as the representative of Israel. "There will I meet thee, and com-

mune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I give thee in command unto the children of Israel;" Ex. xxv, 22.

The great truth symbolized by this holy ark was that which we are told (2 Cor. v, 19) is the sum of the gospel ministry, viz: "That God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing to them their trespasses." Hence a pious Jew always prayed with his face toward the ark of the covenant. To shew those around him that in "vain is salvation hoped for from the hills, and from the multitude of mountains," where idols were worshiped; he looked toward the place where the propitiation was. Daniel, at the hazard of his life, *would pray* with his windows open toward Jerusalem.

The symbolical meaning of the ark and its appurtenances, accounts for the sacredness and importance attached to it. So far as symbols were concerned, it was the glory of Israel. When the sons of Belial took it out to the camp as a charm to insure success in battle with the Philistines, Eli sat by the wayside, trembling for his safety. When the news

arrived that Israel was beaten, and that his wicked sons were dead, he could bear it; but when it was added—"the ark of God is taken," it broke his heart, and he fell backward and died. When his pious daughter-in-law heard the sad tidings, her pains came upon her, and when her spirit was departing, she told them to call her child Ichabod, saying: "The glory is departed from Israel; for the ark of God is taken."

Like the name of him whom it typified, the ark wherever it went proved the savor of death or of life. To such as Obed Edom its presence proved a blessing; but when the Philistines took it home, that as a charm it might secure *good luck*, neither Dagon their god, nor his priests, nor his worshipers could stand before it; and in every city to which they removed it, the hand of the Lord was heavy upon the people, until they were glad to send it away. For curiously prying into its contents, the Lord smote of the men of Bethshemesh, fifty thousand and three score and ten men.

The manner in which it was carried from place to place, was intended to impress on the minds of the church, that the great truths sym-

bolized by it are to be held up to the view of our dying world by the ministry, the anti-typical sons of Levi. It was to be borne by its staves upon the shoulders of the sons of Kohath. Hence ministers of the gospel are said to bear the name of Jesus through the earth; Acts, ix, 15. Hence the sin of David in removing the ark in a cart drawn by oxen. It was disregarding the law as to the manner of its removal. It was trifling with the propitiation, and insinuating heresy respecting it. In their journeys through the wilderness it was carried with great solemnity on the shoulders of the Levites in front of the great army. It always went before to seek out the resting place. Hence believers in their journey to the heavenly Canaan are said to follow God. When it set forward, Moses said: "Rise up Lord and let thine enemies be scattered, and let them that hate thee flee before thee." And when it rested, he said, "return, O! Lord, to the many thousands of Israel;" Numb. x, 35.

To reconcile at once the congregation and the sanctuary, the type of Heaven, "the High Priest was to appear before the ark, bearing the names of the children of Israel, in the

breastplate of judgment upon his heart." He was to "put the incense (the emblem of the Savior's merits presented by prayer) upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony that he died not." And he was to "take of the blood of the sin offering, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward, and before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood seven times. Thus God's controversy with his people on account of their sins, and his controversy with the holy sanctuary on account of its connection with a sinful people, was removed. Thus they were *reconciled*; thus an *atonement* was made for them.

This work of the High Priest was the type and pledge of what the true advocate or High Priest was to do in Heaven, to reconcile believers and prepare for them mansions there. It was the pledge that he should appear there before his father, with their names upon his heart, and present the blood of his own sacrifice in their behalf, and thus remove all grounds of controversy with them, and with Heaven on their account.

We wish it could be deeply impressed on the mind of every reader that it is to this work of the High Priest within the veil that the allusion always is, when Christ is called *our advocate*, and when he is said to *make intercession for us*. That paganizing principle, that such terms used to express the offices and blessings of our Savior, must be interpreted by reference not to the law and customs of Moses, but to customs among pagan nations, is becoming very popular. We have it from the professor's chair; we see it in commentaries and in school books, that to understand our Savior's office as advocate, we must know what an advocate among the Romans was. Did Old Testament saints so study the term, centuries before the Romans had an existence? Is it true that the kingdom of Satan and church of God are so much alike, that in the things done in the one, we behold how things are done in the other? When we look at the results of such a principle of interpretation, we are amazed that one so diabolical in its spirit and tendency could ever be countenanced by wise and good men for the moment.

2. *The tabernacle of the congregation*, separated from the holy sanctuary by the veil. It

contained the candlestick, and the table for the shew-bread, and the altar for the sweet incense. Into this apartment the priest entered every day, at the hours of the morning and evening sacrifice, to trim the lamps and replenish them with oil, to burn incense, and every Sabbath to place fresh bread on the table. This holy place was a type of the church invisible and militant. In its furniture we see what are the distinguishing marks of a true church.

It contained the golden candlestick. The three branches on each side, with the shaft to which they were united, were all of pure gold, of beaten work. Though seven they were one candlestick. On each branch was a lamp filled "with pure oil, olive beaten for the light, to cause the lamp to burn continually; Lev. xxiv. These types are thus explained: "The seven candlesticks are the seven churches." Rev. i, 20. And "the seven lamps burning before the throne of God, are the seven spirits of God"—i. e., the holy spirit. Rev. iv, 5. In allusion to the work of the priest, morning and evening, in trimming the lamps, our Lord thus prefaces his address to the church of Ephesus: "These things said he that holdeth the seven stars in

his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks.”

Thus it appears that all the churches of Christ are united with Christ, and are one in him. By his word and spirit dwelling in them they shine as lights in the world. They are absolutely dependent on the constant care of their High Priest for daily and fresh supplies of his spirit. Were he who walks in the midst of the candlesticks to leave them, their graces would die, the lights would go out; and both the church and the world around would be in darkness.

It contained the table of the shew-bread. On a table covered with pure gold, the priest was to place, in two rows, twelve fresh loaves every Sabbath. Bread used religiously in the house of God, is always the emblem of the body of Christ. “I am the living bread which come down from Heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever.” John, vi, 51. On the same principle that wine, when used as the symbol of the Savior’s blood, “cheereth God and man.” God and all believers delight in bread as the symbol of the Savior’s broken body. We are familiar with the idea that

without the true bread, sinners would as certainly perish in sin, as that without literal bread their bodies would die with hunger. But it is not more true that without the bread from Heaven there could not be saved sinners, than it is true that without it there could be *no saving God*. Hence the shew-bread was indispensable in the typical house, to shew that a church which has no use for the broken body of the Redeemer, has no communion with God, and is not a member of the body of Christ. It may be a synagogue of Satan — or it may be a society of very decent, very learned, and even very religious people. But it is a house where souls are starving and where there is nothing to keep them alive. The place where God delights to dwell, and where his gracious presence may be expected is, where, by the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments, the true bread of life, is set forth. There, believing sinners can have communion with the Father and his son Jesus Christ, and with one another. There souls are every Sabbath fed, and refreshed and strengthened.

It contained the golden altar of burnt in-

cense. On this altar (a type of Christ in his intercession) the priest, when he went in to trim the lamps after offering a continual sacrifice, burnt the sweet incense made of spices, stacte and onycha and galbanum, with frankincense, tempered with pure holy oil, beaten very small. To make it for any other purpose was a crime to be punished with death or excommunication. Ex. xxx, 34, 38. This holy incense was the type of prayer, or rather of the Savior's merits held up before the Holy One in the prayers of the Redeemer, or of the redeemed in his name, Rev. v, 8, and viii, 3. Christ is said to have been *bruised*, and when his merits are presented, God is said to *smell a sweet smell*. While it was burning the whole multitude of the people were praying without, Luke i, 10. The coal with which it was kindled was always taken from the altar where the sacrifice was burnt, and was the symbol of the agency of the Holy Spirit in his gracious work, Isaiah vi, 6, 7; Luke iii, 16. A prayerless people, or a people without the spirit of Jesus or a spirit of grace and supplication is not a church of Christ. Those who belong to the invisible militant Church of Christ,

not only say prayers, but they pray.— They have the spirit of Jesus helping their infirmities, and making intercession for them through the merits of the sacrifice for sin. But by sinning they may grieve the spirit, deprive themselves of the enjoyment of their Savior's presence, God may not hear their prayers, and all their graces may be in a dying condition. There is no way in which they can be reconciled and obtain a revival but by their High Priest using the blood of atonement afresh in their behalf. This is the great truth signified by reconciling the tabernacle of the congregation, and at the same time the congregation itself, with blood. It was sprinkled, no doubt, as when making an atonement for a sin of ignorance (Lev. iv), on the horns of the altar of sweet incense. A horn is the symbol of power. The blood sprinkled there signified that the power of Jesus, when interceding for his people, and the power of his people when praying for themselves, is derived from the blood of the sacrifice for sin. It was that which made Jacob mighty so that as a prince he prevailed with God.

3. *The altar which stood in the court be-*

fore the door of the tabernacle³ was to be reconciled. This brazen altar was a type of Christ (Heb. xiii, 10)—not of his divine nature, as some allege. Would not the attempt to make a type of the divine nature be a violation of the second commandment? Not only the priest, but the offering and the altar were all shadows of him who was to come. It was anointed for that purpose with holy oil. Hence there could be lawfully but one altar. And hence the universal horror when the false report reached the Israelites that the monument erected by their brethren at the passage of Jordan was intended as an altar for sacrifice. They considered it a public expression of faith in some other Savior than him who was typified at the place where God had recorded his name. Hence, also, when the ten tribes under Jeroboam set up their altars at Bethel and Dan, they unchurched themselves. It was an open declaration that they would have neither part nor lot in the Messiah worshiped at Jerusalem.

We have said that the court in which this altar stood was a type of the visible church consisting of all credible professors of faith

and their children. A temple without an altar for sacrifice could not be the house of God. And that society which has no place in its creed for an atoning Savior, may be any thing else, but can not be a part of the visible church of Christ. Jesus, though the Son of God, has no power to save a sinner, but that which is derived from his blood.

But when the High Priest had sprinkled the blood of the sin offering in the holy sanctuary, and in the tabernacle of the congregation, and on the altar, an important service yet remained.

4. *The High Priest, as the representative of the congregation, was to lay both his hands on the head of the scape goat, and transfer to it all their sins.* Thus it was typified that a church or individual who would be savingly interested in the ascended Savior, must lay the hand of faith on his head with sincere confession of his sins, and thus put them away. The term confession of sin, is used in reference to this ceremony, when the apostle John tells us that the justice and faithfulness of God are pledged for the forgiveness of the confessor. 1 John i, 9.

Imposition of hands always signifies setting apart, and putting something on the head of the individual by transfer. It is used in ordinations. The birth-right privilege of serving the priests in the work of the sanctuary was thus transferred from the first born to the Levites: Num. viii, 10, 12. It was used in blessing. With their hands lifted up over the heads of the congregation, Aaron and his sons were to pronounce the blessing (Num. vi, 22, 27), and God calls this *putting my name upon the children of Israel*. The same form was used in *cursing*, i. e., in setting apart for destruction. The man who, by gross sins, had brought guilt upon the land, was to be brought without the camp, and the witnesses were to lay their hands upon his head, and publicly declare his sin; and when they had thus transferred all the guilt which his sin would have brought upon the nation, to his own head, all the congregation were to stone him till he died. Hence, when God laid our iniquities upon the head of his son, and thus set him apart to die without the gates for us, he is said to have been made a curse for us; Gal. iii, 13.

Some learned men can not bear the idea that

Jesus was *substituted* in the room of his body, the invisible church, or that the sins of believers are imputed to him, or his righteousness imputed to them. But this only proves that some men are too learned for the religion of the Bible. We can not conceive of language which would convey the idea of substitution and imputation more clearly—"Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him the iniquity of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat," etc. Take away the idea of substitution and imputation, and one of the most solemn ceremonies in the Jewish church is indefensible. Paganism itself can not present a more unmeaning spectacle than that which was seen on the morning of the jubilee, and on the morning of the great day of atonement every year—a large congregation standing around a little kid, and the High Priest with both hands upon its head confessing their sins. But intelligent worshipers understood it. It signified that when Messiah comes to save us, he will take our place, and God shall lay upon him the iniquities of us all.

5. *The goat bearing the iniquities of the congregation was to be led into a land not inhabited, and let go.* Thus, believers were taught that when God reconciles them to himself, their sins shall never more be remembered against them. The sinner who hides his sins and refuses to confess, has abundant assurance that they shall be exposed in the day which shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness. But we know of no Scripture which gives reason to believe that there shall be any publication of the sins of believers in the last day. The contrary idea seems to be held out clearly in all the ceremonies and terms employed to express a believer's pardon. His sins are said to be borne from him into a wilderness—to be blotted out—to be cast behind God's back—to be hid in the depth of the sea. God is said to remember them no more.

Such were the principal ceremonies by which the High Priest made the atonement once every year; and by which every fiftieth year the jubilee was introduced. There are two principles which it is important to keep constantly in view in the exposition of the chapter before us, viz :

In the first place — All the privileges here enumerated were to be proclaimed with sound of trumpet, as resulting from the typical atonement, and as pledges of spiritual blessings through the atonement. It is remarkable of all the ordinances of the Old Testament which pointed to the blood of Jesus for the remission of sins, that they had some immediate effect which served as the pledge of the efficacy of Messiah's blood. The immediate influence of the blood of bulls and goats, and of the ashes of an heifer, in restoring the unclean to the privileges of God's house, was the pledge of the efficacy of the blood of Christ, in purging the conscience from dead works: Heb. ix, 13, 14. The blood of the paschal lamb sprinkled on the lintel and side posts of the door, saved all the first born of Israel, while there was death in all the houses of the Egyptians. This was God's pledge that in the great day every soul shall be safe who is found in that house which he has put under the protection of the blood of His Son.

The great day of atonement was every year followed with some similar pledge. The whole congregation was santified to the purifying of

the flesh. They were typically made a righteous and holy people. Every seventh year it released all the poor from debt, Deut. xv, 1, 11, and procured a whole year of Sabbath, Lev. xxv, 1, 9. This was the pledge that through the atonement to be made by the shedding of the blood of Jesus, every believer should obtain the forgiveness of all his sins, and everlasting rest with his master in Heaven. On the evening of that day of expiation which introduced the year of release, one would suppose that even the little children would understand the meaning of that petition which our Lord taught his disciples to use: "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." But in the services of that day in which the jubilee commenced, and in the privileges resulting from it, we have the fullest representation of the work of reconciliation, and of the innumerable blessings which flow from it, both to Jews and to Gentile.

In the second place — The privileges secured by the typical atonement were types as well as pledges of the blessings of the atonement. We must keep this principle constantly in view as our polar-star, if we would arrive at a cor-

rect exposition of the jubilee. Whatever, therefore, may be meant by the liberty proclaimed to all the land, the restoration of inheritances, and the privilege of buying servants of the heathen round about, etc., etc., the mind of man can not conceive of wickedness more diabolical than attempting to explain any of these things as types of the African slave-trade or American slavery, or quoting them in justification of any thing which is inconsistent with the law of God. Such things are done and perhaps done conscientiously in the house of God, and they ought to be held up to view as frightful samples of the insanity to which every man dooms himself, the moment he deliberately undertakes to convert gospel ordinances into a shield to cover him from the wrath of God, while living in the indulgence of his lusts.

II. *The trumpet of the Jubilee was to be sounded.* "Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of the atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land:" Lev. xxv, 9. The use of the trumpet was not an accident or mere appendage

to the temple worship. It was the sacred symbol of the gospel, whether preached by the Son of God himself, or the heralds of his cross. They are both called by the same name. That word of power which is to raise the dead in the last day, is called the shout of the Lord, the voice of the Archangel, and the trump of God. The command to preach the gospel plainly and fearlessly is, "set the trumpet to thy lips" — "lift up thy voice like a trumpet." Ministers of the Gospel are symbolized (Rev. viii, 3-12) by angels sounding with their trumpets. The fact that this instrument was the type of so important a means of salvation, accounts for the particularity with which its formation and use are regulated, and the allusion to it for the use of gospel heralds in the duties of their office; and the pains with which the miracles accompanying the use of it are recorded in the Old Testament. They are recorded as presages of the future triumphs of the gospel.

A considerable portion of the tenth chapter of the book of Numbers is occupied with directions respecting this holy symbol. "Make thee two trumpets of silver; of a whole piece shall thou make them," etc. God's word is

pure as silver tried in the furnace seven times. They must not be mixed with any other metal. A trumpet of silver mixed with iron or clay might typify that preaching, which is a compound of gospel and metaphysics, and paganism, and a kind of morality which, some would have us believe, is to be found in the Old Testament. But the gospel which God commands his servants to preach is pure as silver—and of a whole piece.

The anointed sons of Aaron and their servants the Levites were to blow the trumpets; the former only were to use the two of which the chapter just quoted speaks. None but Jesus Christ and his commissioned servants have authority to preach the gospel.

By different, distinct sounds on those instruments, the priest regulated their marches in the wilderness, and called them to their solemn feasts. "When ye go to war in your land against the enemy that oppresseth you, then shall ye blow an alarm with the trumpet, and ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies. Also in the day of your gladness and in the beginning of your months, ye shall blow with

the trumpet over your burnt offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings, that they may be to you for a memorial before your God; I am the Lord."

In the law requiring distinct and certain sounds for those different purposes, the apostle Paul finds an argument for preaching the gospel in words easy to be understood; and a severe reproof of those ministers at Corinth who were so ambitious of preaching in an unknown tongue; 1 Cor. xiv, 9. A priest who would have amused himself and the congregation with musical sounds without meaning, on the holy trumpet, would not have been more guilty of profaning the house of God, than a minister who is too learned, or too foolish to be understood.

The preaching of the gospel has, in every age, been foolishness to the world. They consider it fanaticism to trust in God for great results from such feeble instrumentality. The history of the triumphs of his church, and the deliverance wrought in their behalf by means of the sacred trumpets, rebukes this spirit of infidelity.

A pious army of Israelites placed more reli-

ance in the trumpet with which the priest blew an alarm against their enemies, than in all their engines and weapons of war. When Moses, shortly before his death, sent out an army against the Midianites, "he sent a thousand of every tribe, and Phinehas the son of Eleazar the priest, to war, with the holy instruments, and the trumpet to blow in his hand." Num. xxxi, 6. The sun has never shone on a more fanatical scene (according to the frequent acceptance of that phrase in our day), than the taking of the city of Jericho. But that which men call fanaticism is sometimes neither more nor less than faith in an Almighty and faithful God. The high walls of that strongly fortified city fell flat at the sound of trumpets, made of the horns of the sacrifices, blown by the priests of God. We can hardly conceive of a case in which it would be more fanatical (humanly speaking) to hope for success, than in the reformation under Gideon; Judges vii. All Israel with an exception here and there, had forsaken the God of their fathers, and worshiped Baal; and Joash the father of Gideon was among the ringleaders in the iniquity. For seven years they had been oppressed by the

Midianites, and Amalekites, and children of the east. Every year those nations would come up, with their tents and cattle, "like grasshoppers for multitude," and remain in the land until they "left no sustenance for Israel, nor sheep nor ox nor ass." And to such a degree were Israel debased by idolatry and dispirited by oppression, that when the enemy made his appearance, they "hid in the dens which are in the mountains, and caves and strong holds." But Gideon, though a young man, was "a mighty man of valor." At the command of God he undertook the work of reformation singlehanded. When the Midianites and their confederates heard that he had cut down his father's grove, and was reviving the worship of the God of Israel, they came up with all their forces. The inspired historian describing their encampment on the night preceding their defeat, says: "The Midianites, and Amalekites, and all the children of the east, lay along the valley like grasshoppers for multitude; and their camels were without number, as the sand by the sea side for multitude." But the spirit of the Lord came upon Gideon, and he blew the trumpet. Both friends

and enemies knew the meaning, when the sound of the alarm of war from the sacred trumpet was ringing over hill and dale. It was the voice of the God of Israel calling upon Dan and Asher and Naphtali, and all the tribes to come up to his help against the mighty. No wonder that it struck terror into the hearts of his enemies; for their fathers had told them of the exploits of the Israelitish armies, when the shout of confidence in God accompanied the sound of the holy trumpet, in Rephidim and at Gideon. The result was, that with three hundred men, Gideon, by the simple means of blowing with trumpets, and holding lighted lamps in their hands, routed one of the most numerous armies that ever invaded the holy land. When Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, came up against Judah with "eight hundred thousand chosen men, being mighty men of valor," Abijah was not afraid to meet him with half that number. With unshaken confidence in God, and a firm persuasion that the means by which he will save are those which he has appointed, however weak and unpromising they may seem to be, he set the battle in array against his haughty adversary, and thus ex-

postulated with him, from the top of Mount Zemarain, on the madness of his enterprise: "God himself is with us for our captain, and his priests with sounding trumpets to cry alarm against you. O! children of Israel fight not against the Lord God of your fathers, for ye shall not prosper;" 2 Chron. xiii, 12. But Jeroboam was too much of a philosopher to be moved by such preaching. There had been a great *march of mind* since the introduction of those old trumpets into the church; he had an army of almost a million of picked warriors; and he had made a disposition of his overwhelming force that nothing but a miracle could deprive him of the victory. "He caused an ambushment to come behind them so that when Judah looked, behold the battle was before and behind." But, "they cried unto the Lord, and the priests sounded with the trumpets. Then the men of Judah gave a shout; and as the men of Judah shouted, it came to pass that God smote Jeroboam and all Israel before Abijah and Judah—and there fell down slain of Israel, five hundred thousand chosen men."

Such signal exploits through the power of

God accompanying the use of the typical trumpet are recorded as presages of the future triumphs of the gospel. The church was thus taught that the Redeemer would save his people; and demolish the strongholds of Satan, and put to flight armies of aliens, through the foolishness of preaching.

The Son of God sent out a few fishermen with no weapons but the gospel trumpet, and faith in their ascended Savior, to destroy the kingdom of Satan, and establish on its ruins a kingdom of righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. And the hand of the Lord was with them. At every blast of the holy trumpets the pagan temples shook like the walls of Jericho. The devil-gods whom the nations worshiped were terrified. And notwithstanding that the united powers of earth and hell were against them, that overthrow of pagan powers was effected which the apostle John thus describes: "And the stars of Heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind."

Before the Reformation, most of the churches in Christendom were becoming unclean powers.

The man of sin had usurped the place of God ; the atonement was banished ; and all concern for the heathen, and pity for the souls of men had expired. But Luther, though a poor monk, was like Gideon, a man of valor. The spirit of the Lord came upon him. He arose and blew the trumpet ; and in a few years the church and the world, to a considerable extent, were delivered from the dominion of the devil, and the son of perdition.

It is not enthusiasm to say, that through the same instrumentality, more than two millions of our fellow-men, some of them our brethren in Christ, will be delivered from their chains, and our churches from the dominion of the slaveholding spirit. Until lately, the preaching against this sin has been a mixture of some truth from the New Testament, with some slanders on the patriarchs, and members of the Old Testament, and the law of Moses. Every blast from such a trumpet only made the slaveholding spirit more rampant in the house of God. But within a few years past ministers and Christians generally have learned that the morality of the word of God is pure and consistent throughout. They blow a

trumpet which is of pure silver—of a *whole piece*; and every slaveholder on our continent is quailing under the sound. Their confusion in some regions was scarcely exceeded when “all the host cried, and ran, and fled—and the Lord set every man’s hand against his fellow.” If the people would cry unto the Lord, and the priests would blow the right trumpet and give certain sounds, the hand of the Lord would do wonders.

In the ceremony of blowing the trumpet over their burnt offerings and sacrifices, we have a definition of that kind of preaching, which the Lord will bless to the salvation of sinners. That in which Christ crucified is the prominent theme—that which brings the atonement to bear against every sin in the land—that which holds up the great truths typified in all their burnt offerings and sacrifices, on all occasions, and especially in the morning of the day of atonement and of the Jubilee in blowing the gospel trumpet.

The meaning, then, of causing the trumpet to sound throughout all the land, proclaiming that the atonement was made, and that the privileges secured by it to the congregation

and pious strangers were to be regarded as the law of the land, is obvious. It was the pledge that in due time our great High Priest should personally, or by his heralds, proclaim the true atonement, and call upon the nations of the earth, Jews and strangers, to come and enjoy its blessings. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the great trumpet shall be blown, and they shall come which were ready to perish in the land of Assyria, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and shall worship the Lord in the Holy Mount at Jerusalem." Isaiah, xxvii, 13.

III.—*The atonement secured to all the inhabitants of the land a year of Sabbath.* "And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year—a Jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you; ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it, nor gather the grapes in it, of the vine undressed. For it is a Jubilee, it shall be holy unto you; ye shall eat the increase thereof, out of the field;" Levit. xxv, 10-12.

We must recollect that the year immediately preceding the jubilee was a Sabbath. Of course they abstained from labor for two whole years, and had no ingathering or harvest for three

years, viz: from the sixth till the ninth year. We must, also, recollect that every seventh year the atonement released all the poor from their debts (Deut. xv, 1), and they were forbidden under pain of God's displeasure, to refuse lending a poor man sufficient for his need, through fear of having to forgive him in the year of release. In the meantime their obligations to support the temple service, and the Levites, and the widows, and the fatherless and strangers, never ceased.

Such arrangements prove that the Sinai covenant, never originated in man's wisdom. The philosophers of France, abolished the Sabbath, and substituted a decade or tenth day, lest so many days of rest should beggar the nation. Our government requires, by law, the profanation of the Sabbath, by keeping open upward of ten thousand post-offices, and the transportation of the mail, by the labors of many thousands of men and beasts, lest our revenue and commerce should decline. But no nation was ever made poor by the fear of God. He promised Israel that their temporal as well as spiritual interests, should be increased by the conscientious observance of

their Sabbaths. "The land shall yield her fruit, and ye shall eat your fill, and dwell therein, in safety. And if ye shall say, what shall we eat in the seventh year? Behold! we shall not sow nor gather in our increase; then will I command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years. And ye shall sow the eighth year, and eat yet of the old fruit until the ninth year, until her fruit come in, shall ye eat of the old store," Levit. xxv, 19-22.

From the day that Israel crossed Jordan, till their temple was finally destroyed, they never were impoverished by observing so many days and years of Sabbath. But their history abundantly attests that disregarding them proved their ruin. God anticipated that in the pride of their wisdom, they might undertake to better their condition by mending his institutions, or setting them aside altogether. He therefore warned them that this sin should not go unpunished — he would scatter them among the heathen; their land should be destroyed, and their cities laid waste; and they should spend in captivity one year for every Sabbath year profaned by labor: Lev. xxvi, 31-33.

But, disregarding both his promises and threatenings, they determined that it would be imprudent to spend so much time without labor. The result was, they spent seventy years in captivity at Babylon; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 14-21: He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

The important inquiry here is, What was the design of these years of Sabbath? The temporal prosperity of the nation was not the great or ultimate object. Many of the ordinances of the Old Testament had, in themselves, no tendency to make the nation either prosperous or happy. If we leave out of view their typical character, it would be difficult to point out their goodness.

What blessing secured by the death and intercession of our Lord, was typified by the year of Sabbath, which followed the typical expiation, on the morning of the jubilee? The answer obviously is — eternal Sabbath or rest in Heaven. The meaning of typical things is as unvarying and fixed as that of words in any language. The meaning of one Sabbath determines the meaning of all. In the epistle to the Hebrews (chap. iv), the author speaks of the rest of the seventh day when our parents

were in Eden; and that which was observed under Jesus or Joshua; and that of which David speaks in the Psalms, as prefiguring *the rest which remaineth for the people of God*; from which all unbelievers will be excluded. When, therefore the priest, by blowing the jubilee trumpet, proclaimed the atonement, and a year of rest from labor as one of its fruits, he preached, typically, everlasting rest in Heaven, through the merits of the death of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We can not believe, with some men of great names, that the temple service imparted no more instruction to the worshipers, than Latin prayers to English Papists. It is admitted that much more light shines on the New Testament Church, than ever shone on that of the Old Testament. It is also admitted that Prophets speak of Christians as knowing more than Jewish believers. But whether such prophets had in their eye, Christians in the age of the Crusades, or in the nineteenth century, or under the Millennium, is a question which it would be worth while to determine. It is, indeed, impossible to say precisely how much knowledge any Old Testament believer pos-

sessed. The degree of every man's wisdom will depend, not merely on the means of instruction he is favored with, but also on the spirit and diligence with which he improves them. Even with the additional light of the New Testament, some professed Christians are shamefully ignorant of the way of salvation. But this we are sure of—If any Old Testament believer groped his way to Heaven, without any distinct views of the ground of his acceptance with God, it was not because there was no light in the temple service. He must have been extremely inattentive at the house of God, who was ignorant that it is only through the merits of Messiah's atonement, that remission of sins and everlasting rest in Heaven are to be obtained. Every year he had seen the High Priest "kill the goat of the sin offering that is for the people—bring his blood within the vail, and sprinkle it upon the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat." He had also seen him as the representative of the people—"lay both of his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of Israel, and all their transgressions, in all their sins,

putting them upon the head of the live goat." He had seen his expiation of sin followed every sixth, and every forty-ninth year, by a whole year of rest. It would be difficult to find a text in the New Testament, or an ordinance in the Christian Church, in which the connection between the death of Jesus, and rest in Heaven, is more clearly presented.

The arrangement that the nation, through the whole of the jubilee Sabbath and the year preceding, were to live on the fruits of God's blessing on their labors in the sixth year, rebukes the antinomian spirit on the one hand, and the spirit of self-righteousness on the other. The divine agency and human instrumentality are joined together in the gospel, and to put them asunder, is mischievous folly. It is as true in temporal as in spiritual things—"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." And it is as true in spiritual as in temporal matters—"The hand of the diligent maketh rich." The man who, in the prospect of the jubilee, would neither plow nor sow, and expect the Lord to fill his barn; and he who would expect to reap a plentiful harvest without the blessing of Heaven on his

labors, would be equally, and superlatively foolish. That rebel who turns his back on the Savior, and the offers of his grace, and says he will work his own passage to Heaven; and that other rebel who stands aloof from the means of salvation, with the weapons of rebellion in his hand, and tells us that he is waiting God's time, and expects the grace of God to take him to Heaven, and in the meantime refuses to ground his arms—are engaged in the same war with God; and their end will be the same.

IV.—*Liberty as one of the privileges secured by the atonement was to be proclaimed with the sound of the trumpet, throughout all the land to all the inhabitants thereof.* We often hear the inquiries—did the atonement procure the release of slaves? And as to those who were in limited and voluntary servitude—did it release the Hebrew servant only, or Gentile servants, or both? Much as we dislike negative preaching (for there is no end to it), we must show that it did not release slaves, for there were none under the law of Moses to release; that it did not release Hebrew servants, for their release was provided for by another statute;

and then, that it did release all servants who were strangers.

1. *The Jubilee released no slaves, because, lawfully, there could be none in Israel to release.* Notwithstanding the conflicting opinions of commentators on this point, in some respects they generally agree, that under the law given at Sinai, as to the practice of enslaving men, there was but little difference between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan. Some of them insist that the jubilee had no influence on slaves; because they are sure a just God would not countenance such injustice as depriving men of their property without compensation. Others gravely give it as their opinion that it did release the slaves. All agree that the Holy land was like the Pagan land around it—a place for trading in the bodies and souls of men. The author of the present and best work on “the gospel of the Old Testament,” in the application of his views of the Jubilee says: “Imagine the captive in Israel in his chains, as year by year he heard the well known trumpet sound, repeating on each returning day of expectation, the still unaltered, still approaching promise. Did he not listen

think you? Did he not long? Did he not count the years as they went by, to find how many were to come? As if the Holy land beyond all controversy, was a land where strangers because they had been whipped in a military fight, or secured by the kidnappers, were to lie in chains fifty years. As if when pious Israelites went up to the house of God on the day of atonement, they left behind them strangers groaning under their heavy chains, listening to the sound of the trumpet, and counting how many times they must yet hear it before fifty years of misery would be finished. Can any man imagine himself in such a region without feeling as if he were in the confines of Hell?"

We shall not in this place undertake by a formal argument to prove that slavery is sinful. It will be sufficient briefly to notice the radical and eternal difference between voluntary servitude and slavery, between a master and a slaveholder, or one who holds his neighbor as his property.

Servitude and slavery are both of very ancient origin. They existed in the world soon after grace and sin began to reign in the hearts

of men. As a general remark, types are shadows of *good* things to come. But some types were in themselves physical, and some of them moral evils, and of course were shadows of evil things. Some of them were such persons and things as were allowed in the church of God; others are to be looked for in the kingdom of Satan only. But when we say that these systems were merely coeval and were both typical, we know of no other point of resemblance. In the following and other particulars they are radically different.

1. *Servitude and slavery are opposites in their origin, in their spirit and tendency.*—The one is an institution of God; the other an institution of the Devil. One system is regulated by the law of supreme love to God, and love to man; the other is regulated by sin. The one recognizes the servant as an immortal being created in the image of God, and capable, through grace, of shining as the stars for every man. The other considers the slave as a mere thing, treats him as a piece of property, and degrades him to a level with the lowest of the brutes. One is voluntary; the other is involuntary. One is limited, the other is generally

unlimited, terminating only with death. The one pays the poor man his wages, and leaves him in full possession of his inalienable rights. The other robs him of all his earnings, excepting so much as is necessary to enable him to endure oppression; and strips him of all the rights which God has given him. Voluntary servitude in some form exists wherever there are rich and poor, and is necessary to the happiness and prosperity of every community. Slavery is like the mildew and the pestilence in every land on which it lights. The curse of God has followed it, and will follow it till the end of time. Servitude is favorable to the present and future happiness of both master and servant. Slavery is an invention of the destroyer to murder the present peace of both slaveholder and slave, and to make them forever miserable beyond the grave.

Every attempt to thrive under a slaveholding system, is an attempt to thrive in a state of warfare with Heaven, and the rights of mankind. All the machinery now in operation to sustain the system in our land is necessary to its support in any country. You must put out the eyes of the slave's soul; for if you

give him light without grace, he will rise and cut his master's throat. You must give him the full number of lashes on his bare back, every time he is caught reading his Bible, or listening to the sound of the gospel trumpet, for if he finds that he is a man, with a soul to be saved or lost forever, and that there is a God who will hear the cries of the oppressed; he will either pray down judgment from Heaven; or, under the influence of those passions which ignorance and slavery have fastened in his bosom, he will rise and take the work of vengeance in his own hand. Our whipping-posts, and dungeons, and penitentiaries, and even the gallows is erected in the South to hang by the neck till he is dead, the man who dares to enlighten the benighted soul of a slave, are necessary appendages to the system. In addition to these you must sooner or later, call in the aid of mobs, and bloody enactments to suppress the liberty of speech and the press. And after all you can not succeed; because you can not triumph over Him who has revealed it as a part of his settled plan for the government of our world, that he will make bare his arm to punish the oppressor, and deliver the oppressed.

2. *Master and slaveholder are represented in the Scriptures as types of very different characters.* The title *master*, like all the technical terms of the New Testament, is used in reference to some thing under the law of Moses which was typical. We read of two masters, Jesus Christ, the Savior of sinners, and the destroyer of sinners called "the spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience." Now, whether is the master or the slaveholder the type of Jesus Christ? And which is the type of the destroyer? To make a man sustaining the lawful and scriptural relation of master as such, the type of the devil; and one sustaining the unlawful relation of oppressor, as such, the type of our glorious master in Heaven, vitiates a fundamental principle in the interpretation of typical things, viz: That which is morally good can not be the type of that which is morally evil; and that which is morally evil can not be the type of that which is morally good. We are shocked at the very idea of a good man being made the type of the wicked one; and it is still more shocking to suppose, a wicked man, as such, the type of the Son of God. The truth is that under the typ-

ical dispensation, masters of voluntary servants were the typical saviors; and slave masters were the typical devils.

3. *Masters and slaveholders have always, properly, belonged to different kingdoms.* From the beginning there have been but two kingdoms in the world—the kingdom or church of God, and the kingdom of the devil. Now, where shall we look for the type of the Son of God, and the type of the arch enemy of God, but in their respective kingdoms.

The proper place for him who, in his relation to his fellow-men, is the type of our divine master, is in the church—in that kingdom where God is recognized as supreme—where that holy law, pure as silver tried in the furnace, regulates every thing—and where nothing dishonorable to his name, or injurious to men, can be indulged but at the peril of his everlasting displeasure. The appropriate place for him who in the usurped authority which he exercises over his brother, is the type of the prince of oppressors, has always been in that kingdom which is founded on war with Heaven, where lust and sin regulate every thing, and where devil-worship is the highest act of devotion.

It is true, and it is faithfully recorded by the inspired historians, among the foulest blots on the character of the Old Testament church, that slaveholders were at different times admitted to her communion. But it is ascribed not to the want of purity in the will of God, as revealed in the law of Moses, but to the unfaithfulness of such watchmen as the prophet styles "dumb dogs that can not bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber." It was to the toleration of this with other Heaven-daring sins in her communion, that Jeremiah and other prophets traced one of the most terrible displays of God's wrath which the world has ever seen, or ever will see.

4. *The condition of voluntary servants in Israel, and slaves in Pagan lands were the appropriate types of the condition of the servants of Jesus Christ, and the servants of sin.*

The servants in Israel were Hebrews or strangers, who had waxen poor or fallen into decay, or on some other account found it desirable to sell their services for a term of years, for a sum which would compensate them, and extricate them from difficulties. Their masters were bound to afford all necessary pro-

tection, and instruction, and supply of their wants. Those who are familiar with the law of Moses know that he was bound to see to whatever was necessary to the promotion of their present and everlasting happiness. In allusion to the abundant provision which it made for them, we find Old Testament believers casting themselves with all their wants on their Savior's bounty, and pleading all his promises, in one breath, by saying—O Lord, I am thy servant.

But the condition of a slave in the hands of a Pagan master, claiming absolute power over him, treating him as a mere chattel, either not knowing, or not caring for, the law of love, nor any law but lust and power, was the suitable type of the condition of all the slaves of sin.

5. *The typical meaning of the release of a servant, and that of a slave, are very different.*

The release of a voluntary servant from his master typified that joyful event, when the servant of Jesus Christ is dismissed from his master's work on earth, and called to the enjoyment of everlasting rest in Heaven. Hence, release in the jubilee was connected with a year of typical rest. Pious Simeon prays for

his death in the very terms in which a servant would ask for release from his master's work, when the term had expired — Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace.

But the release of a slave from the grasp of his oppressor, was typical of that change which every saved sinner experiences when "turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God" — when delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the Kingdom of God's dear Son.

It is not pleasant to one who is living on the unrighteous gain of oppression, to be told that the word of God points out the slave master as the type of the devil. We would hardly dare to do so in the softest terms, could it be avoided without incurring the guilt of cowardice, and of handling the Word of God deceitfully. The fact, however, is susceptible of easy and abundant proof.

6. *The salvation of Noah and his family from the tyrants of the old world by water, is recognized as typical of our salvation from sin, by the Holy Spirit.*

He lived in a world of oppressors. "The earth was filled with violence." The Lord

saved him by a flood which swept the sons of violence from the face of the earth with every monument and vestige of their wickedness. The apostle tells us that the water which swept the tyrants away while it floated the ark containing Noah's family in safety, had the same symbolical meaning with the water in baptism. "The like figure whereunto, even baptism doth also now save us, etc.:" 1 Pet. iii, 21. .

7. *The deliverance of the Jewish nation from bondage in Babylon is repeatedly referred to as a shadow of deliverance from spiritual bondage.*—They were not merely captives. Ezra says (ix, 9), they were *bondmen* or servants; and he know what kind of bondage they were held in who were taken captive by pagans. The glowing prediction of their deliverance, by the prophet Isaiah (Isaiah, lii, 7, 8), is applied (Rom. x, 15), to the triumphs of the gospel in bringing sinners to the enjoyment of the liberty of the sons of God. The one event was typical of the other. Hence that prediction which had a primary and partial accomplishment in the return of the Jews to their own land, was to have its ultimate fulfillment in the conversion of sinners through the preaching of the

resurrection by the apostles and their successors. Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones was intended to illustrate the power of God in delivering, both from temporal and spiritual captivity. In the farewell address of Moses to Israel it is revealed as a part of God's future government of his people, that when scattered among the heathen for their iniquities, they should be restored through repentance, and faith, and supplication to the Lord; Deut. xxix, 1—6. For this purpose Ezekiel was sent among the captives at Babylon. But it seemed to be a hopeless enterprise. They were proud, stubborn, and perpetually disposed to throw the blame of all their troubles on that *incendiary* Jeremiah. To shew what the word of the Lord can do when the preaching of it is accompanied with his power in bringing sinners to cry to him for deliverance, the prophet was carried out in the spirit and set down in the midst of a valley full of dry bones. He was commanded to prophesy or preach to them. And he prophesied and said: "O! ye dry bones hear the word of the Lord." In the meantime, the breath of the Lord breathed upon them. And immediately there stood up

an exceeding great army of attentive hearers; Ezek. xxxviii, 4. Thus was illustrated the power of God our Savior, both in delivering sinners from slavery at Babylon, and in that deliverance from slavery to sin of which the other was the type and pledge.

The man who is thriving on the oppression of his fellow-men may amuse himself by fancying that his occupation places him by the side of Abraham the father of the faithful, and the friend of God. But in fact, it places him by the side of these great men of Babylon, who are recorded in God's book as the standing types of the oppressor of souls.

8. *The deliverance of the Hebrews from slavery in Egypt by the blood of the Paschal lamb, was the prominent type of redemption by the blood of Jesus.*

The Passover, by which this signal emancipation was commemorated, held a distinguished place among the ordinances of the Old Testament. It is foreign from our present purpose to consider minutely the nature and design of this institution. It requires a large share of fanaticism to imagine that it was intended for the refreshment and comfort of

slaveholders. A single glance at the design, the regulations, and the exercises appropriate to the occasion, will determine the matter.

In the ordinance of the passover, the lamb, whose blood was sprinkled on the door-posts for the protection of the oppressed Israelites, while the work of death was going on in all the houses of their oppressors; and the Lamb of God whose blood was shed on Mount Calvary, that it might be sprinkled on his body, the church, for their salvation, are the typical and anti-typical Redeemers. Pharoah and his drivers on the one hand; and the prince of darkness and his angels on the other, are related as typical and anti-typical oppressors. The proper exercises while eating the lamb were remembering, with thankfulness, God's great goodness in delivering his people from slavery in Egypt, by the destruction of those who oppressed them; prayer that the same right arm would be made bare for the oppressed in all time to come; bitter sorrow for sin, accompanied with sincere resolutions through grace to depart from all iniquity; and especially faith in the atoning blood symbolized by that which was sprinkled on the lintel and side

posts of their doors. The law required each family separately, if large enough, to eat a lamb; and every servant bought with money, was to partake with his master; Exo. xii, 44. The theory that the masters approved by the law of Moses, were slaveholders, and that the servants were slaves, and not such as sold their services for a limited time, would make the celebration of the passover a piece of solemn foolery. Let us see how they would get along.

The family would sometimes consist of the lately married master and mistress, with from ten to fifty slaves, in chains, in the same condition in which God saw his people when he said to Moses: "I have seen their affliction, and heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows and I am come down to deliver them."

The ordinance was to be introduced by distinctly stating the origin and design. One of the children was to ask, "what mean ye by this service?" In the absence of children, one of the slaves would have to make inquiry. The master of the house was to say: "We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt, and the Lord brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand.

And the Lord shewed signs and wonders, great and sore, upon Egypt, upon Pharaoh, and upon all his household before our eyes;" Deut. vi, 22. This would be "highly incendiary" among slaves. Masters would, no doubt, find it necessary to omit this part of the service altogether.

But there was another circumstance likely to create some demurring on the part of the slaves, if they were conscientious, and not well drilled by *oral instruction*. The first celebration, on the night on which they left Egypt, was to be the model for all future generations. On that night there were no slaveholders in the houses protected by blood. *They were all outside*. It was from their houses that the great cry of lamentation and mourning was held over all the land; for there was not an house where there was not one dead. They were the types of the devil and his angels. And how could the master and mistress "enjoy themselves" with this fact staring them in the face?

Again: There could be but little harmony of feeling in a family consisting of slaves and their oppressors. Would it not disturb the devotion of the master and mistress to hear the sighing of the oppressed accompanied with

the clanking of their chains when any of them happened incautiously to move a limb. One can almost see them watching and listening while the poor wretches were pouring their petitions into the ear of the Lord of Sabbath, lest there should be some prayers of an "incendiary character" among them. The slaves with all sincerity could thank God for that glorious emancipation, and that terrible destruction of tyrants which they were commemorating. They could pray devoutly that he would continue to avenge the oppressed. The galling of their chains, and the sight of their oppressors would help to quicken their devotion. But the master and mistress could not join them. The gain of slaveholding would perhaps reconcile them to any mere form. But they could not *devoutly pray* for "hailstones and coals of fire" upon their own heads. The only prayer they could put up in consistency with their desires and course of life, would be that the Lord would cease to be the God he had manifested himself to be, on that dreadful night in Egypt; that he would bless all the Pharoahs and their drivers, and save them from insurrections among their slaves, and keep

them from such incendiaries as Moses and Aaron.

It has been said that although it was sinful for such idolators as Pharaoh to hold men as property, it could not be sinful for the Israelites, who were members of the church, and professors of the true religion, and of course, would "use their slaves well." So the Israelites thought in the days of Jeremiah, and they tried it, and all Christendom knows the result. They were visited with judgments which scarcely have their parallel in the history of their nation, if we except the final destruction of their city and temple; they were doomed to slavery for seventy years in a foreign land; that all generations may know that the God of Heaven is no respecter of persons; and that no matter who may be the oppressors, he will execute judgment for all that are oppressed.—Read Jeremiah, xxxiv, 9.

9. *Those joyful occasions when captives were rescued from kidnappers or slave-making invaders, were typical of those more joyful seasons in the church, and in the presence of the angels, over sinners who are converted.*

We have abundant proof of this, in the fact

that the conversion of sinners is expressly called "recovering them out of the snare of the Devil, who are *taken captive* by him at his will:" 2 Tim. ii, 26. Hence the glorious ascension of our Lord, victorious over all his enemies in the work of redemption, and the joy which were diffused among angels and the redeemed, is described in terms which have an evident allusion to the return of a Jewish commander from the successful pursuit of some slave-making invader. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive;* thou hast received gifts for men:" Ps. lxxviii, 18. This is applied to our Savior's ascension: Eph. iv, 8. In the prevailing fondness for paganizing the Scriptures by finding in Satan's kingdom the illustration of our Savior's offices and work, most expositors will have it that the allusion by the Psalmist, is to one of those shocking and disgusting scenes in Pagan countries, when a warrior returned home triumphant, dragging at his chariot wheels perhaps some peaceful neighbor, whom he had con-

* Captivity in this connection never means the captors, but the captives.

quered in a very unjust war. It is admitted that in the New Testament when Christians residing in pagan lands are addressed, there are sometimes allusions to the customs around them. But the Psalm which we have quoted was composed for the immediate use of believers in the holy land. It was to be sung by millions who never witnessed nor knew any thing about Pagan customs. And it is a supposition which carries absurdity in the very face of it, to suppose that the Psalmist would compare the glorious ascension of his Redeemer to a scene so revolting to the feelings of any good man, that none but Pagans and devils could contemplate it without horror. Yet even the great and good Dr. Watts, in his paraphrase on Psalm lxviii, 12, to make it accord with a Pagan triumph, makes the *captivity* mean the vanquished captors; and then he has the Savior taking sin, death and hell, up to Heaven with him!! But David had in his eye a scene which was not unfrequent in Israel, and one which the purest mind may contemplate with delight. It was a glorious sight when Abraham returned from his victory over a slave-making army, followed by the captors

now restored to their country and friends. The good king of Salem, when he heard of it, could not keep his throne, but hastened to meet him with bread and wine, and blessed him: Gen. xiv. Perhaps the Psalmist had in view a memorable event in his own history. As long as he lived, he remembered the joy, when he and his men returned to Ziklag, triumphant over the Amalekites, followed by a long train of happy relations, rescued from perpetual slavery: 1 Samuel, xxx. So our Lord is represented as ascending triumphantly to his Father in Heaven, victorious over all the powers of darkness, followed by an innumerable company, who had been snared and taken captive by the devil.

Thus it appears that the good men who rescued captives, and delivered them from slavery, and Jesus who delivered souls from bondage to sin, are related as typical and anti-typical Saviors. But this is not all. The man who ensnares and takes men captive, and reduces them to slavery, is related to the great ensnarer of souls, as the type to its anti-type. These things are not soothing to the feelings of a Christian slaveholder. But if any man charge

us with harshness or severity, our apology is : God made the Bible, and our business is to interpret it plainly.

The light in which the enslaver of captives is here exhibited, accords with the place which is assigned him, in 1 Tim. i, 10. The word translated *manstealer* is *andropodistes*, and literally means one who reduces captives to slavery ; as the word *andropodon*, in Xenophon and other Greek writers, means an enslaved captive. The apostle, in the text just quoted, classes him with murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers. He is named with those for whose punishment the law of Moses specially provided. Yet, commentators are at pains to persuade us that making property of their captives in war, was one of the privileges secured to the Old Testament church, by the ordinance of the jubilee.

10. *The assistance which was to be afforded to all servants escaping from their masters, was typical of that which Jesus promises to all who cry to him for deliverance from the service of sin.*

“Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee ; he shall dwell with thee, even among

you, in that place where he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him:" Deut. xxiii, 15. It is not necessary to know that a servant escaping to Israel, is from a master among Pagans, and of course from one who did not govern his servants according to the law of love to God and man. If he raised the cry for help, the elders of the several gates were to lead out their forces to any extent necessary, to save him from his pursuers. He who was typified by every elder brother in Israel, and is exalted "to deliver the needy when he crieth, and break in pieces the oppressor," has pledged his power over Heaven and earth, that no man shall cry to him in vain. The gates were to be thrown open, that he might choose the place where it liketh him best. The elder of the place was bound to see to the instruction and protection of all within the gates of his inheritance. But the continuance of the fugitive there, would depend on his behavior. Being debased by the united influence of slavery and Paganism, he might prove irreclaimably devoted to idolatry or some wickedness which would require his protection to punish, or chase

him away, as Nehemiah did the son-in-law of Sanballat the Horonite. His standing at first would be simply that of a slave escaping from his master. But if he proved teachable, and eventually pious, he might sell his services for the time prescribed by the law, and be admitted to all the privileges of servants bought with money. Thus, he and his protector would live together as shadows of Jesus Christ and his servants until the jubilee.

That we are not mistaken as to the typical nature of this statute is apparant from our Lord's reference to it, in his remarks to those Jews who professed to believe on him. "If ye continue in my words, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. They answered him, we be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man, how sayest thou, ye shall be made free? Jesus answered them, verily, verily, I say unto you, whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house forever; but the son abideth ever. If the son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed:" John viii, 31—36.

He cautions them not to consider themselves safe, because they professed to believe. They were, perhaps, only the servants of sin, professing a desire to escape. He assures them of all the assistance which the typical statute encourages them to expect. If they proved teachable, disciples indeed, the truth should make them free from their master. It seems they understood the allusion; but it affronted them that they should be compared to runaway slaves. "We are Abraham's seed, and never were brought in bondage to any man. How sayest thou, ye shall be made free." He tells them they were mistaken—"whosoever committeth sin, is the servant of sin." And as the servant fleeing from his master, had no permanent residence in the gate to which he fled, like that of the son whose protection he sought, but might be banished for his wickedness; so that son in whom they professed to believe, might have to abandon them to the dominion of sin. "The servant abideth not in the house forever, but the son abideth ever."

11. *The law required all slave-makers to be put to death, in a way which typified that second death which will be the doom of the finally impenitent.*

If any man in Israel were known to be seized, and held as property by another, the elders were to deliver him, by putting his master publicly to death. "If a man be found stealing any of his brethren, the children of Israel, and maketh merchandise of him, or selleth him; then that thief shall die; and thou shalt put away evil from among you,"—Deut. xxiv, 7. It appears that manstealing does not necessarily imply the separation of the stolen man from his country. The manstealer is not he, only, who goes to a foreign land to catch slaves. The crime may be committed by you on your nearest neighbor, or your own brother. But, lest it should be supposed that God does not care for any but those who are of your brethren, the statute is more sweeping, "He, that stealeth A MAN, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, he shall surely be put to death,"—Ex. xxi, 16. The meaning of the term *stealing* must be ascertained from the eighth commandment. It is the only one used in the decalogue to prohibit taking from our neighbor, unlawfully, in any form, any thing which is his. The man who by night or by day, by fraud or by force, secretly or openly, seizes his neighbors person

and makes it his property, is a *manstealer*—and he must die. The law makes no difference between him who keeps slaves for his own use, and he who sells them. It pays no regard to apologies. Whenever you find men without apologies for their sins, you may take it for granted they have either turned devils, or they have determined to quit sinning. But the manstealer, irrespective of his apologies, must surely be put to death.

The manner in which capital offenders were to be executed, is expressly stated in a few instances. He was to be led forth without the camp. The witnesses were to lay their hands upon his head and state publicly his sin. He was then either hanged upon a tree, as one accursed of God and man, and fit for neither earth nor Heaven: Gal. iii, 13, or he was stoned to death by all the congregation, sometimes, as in the case of Achor, the dead body was burned with fire, to signify that his sin deserved everlasting wrath. If he was hanged, the body must be buried that day, that the land might not be defiled; Deut. xxi, 22, 23.

The following were some of the designs in putting the manstealer to death in this manner:

1. Others were deterred from making property of human beings. This is the design of all public censures and punishments. "And all Israel shall hear and fear." When the Israelites received this statute, they were standing before Mount Sanai, with their staves in their hands, escaping from slavery in Egypt, and on their way to the promised land. Yet the Jesuits tell us that Moses was afraid to say any thing against slavery, on account of its prevalence among those to whom he gave his law! These Jesuits are quite original thinkers.

2. The wrath of God provoked by so heinous a sin was thus averted. So shalt thou put evil from amongst you—is with remarkable frequency assigned as a reason for inflicting the penalty of the law on offenders. It betrays shameful ignorance of the Bible, and excites the sneers of intelligent infidels, to hear Christians, and especially ministers, ask, "what have we, who own no slaves, to do with the sin of slavery?" The ceremony of laying hands upon the head of the offender, and stating his sin, and the phrases, he shall bear his iniquity, and "so shalt thou put away evil

from among you"—imply, that otherwise the nation would have been partakers with him in guilt. This is the doctrine of the Bible every where respecting sins winked at, or encouraged by the nation in which they are committed—they become national sins. We see this principle clearly illustrated in the history of Achor.

3. The enslaved man in addition to his freedom would be an eye witness of the infamous end of his master. The last principle in this count may seem to be a matter of inferior moment. But it was of sufficient importance to be revealed as a fixed principle in God's government. He has not only promised that he will execute judgment for the oppressed, but it is a part of the penalty annexed to the sin of slaveholding, that the slaves shall eventually be witnesses of the disgrace and punishment of their masters. "For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the Lord; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him:" Ps. xii, 5. Among the great crowds assembled to witness the execution of the manstealer, would be that poor man, or that widow, or that fatherless child whose person

he had seized as his property. Parents were specially charged, when telling their children how the Lord delivered them from their masters in Egypt, to say that it was by "signs and wonders great, and sore upon Egypt and upon Pharaoh and his household, BEFORE OUR EYES." They were to tell how they heard the cries of distress from the houses of their oppressors. They were to tell how when they passed the Red sea, they saw the dead bodies of their masters upon the sea shore. They were to tell them how all the congregation stood along the banks of the sea and sung a song of triumph, composed by Moses for that special occasion; and how "Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron took a timbrel in her hand; and all the women went after her with timbrels and with dances. And Miriam answered them, sing ye to the Lord for he hath triumphed gloriously;" Ex. xv, 21. In this way deliverances from oppressors were always celebrated in Israel, as appears from incidental notices in the history of Jephtha and Deborah, David, etc. Thus was typified the triumph of the redeemed in the last day. The apostle Paul (1 Cor. xv, 55), represents all the

saints in the morning of the resurrection, standing with glorious bodies like their Savior's singing the song of victory over their last enemy. "O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?"

4. The manner in which the manstealer was put to death, was both a type and pledge of the second death, which awaits the devil and his angels and all his impenitent servants. By an allusion to the manner in which the condemned man was LED FORTH to be executed without the camp, the Psalmist tells in one breath the dreadful end of apostates. "As for such as turn aside unto their crooked ways, the Lord shall lead them forth with the workers of iniquity." Ps. cxxv, 5.

In allusion to the two ways of disposing of the body of the executed criminal, burying it in the earth to be devoured by worms, or burning it with fire, our Lord tells us that the hell which God has provided for the punishment of the wicked is a place "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Mark ix, 44. The worm of the grave soon devoured the body of the manstealer and others and then died; but the

worm of hell shall prey upon the body and soul for ever and ever; it never dies. The fire which was kindled on the body of the accursed man, soon finished its work and went out. But the fire of Hell will never finish its work; it never goes out, it is unquenchable.

These remarks are sufficient to show that slavery differs radically and eternally from voluntary servitude. They are sufficient to show that the slaveholder has always belonged to Satan's kingdom. We might multiply texts to prove that the word of God always places him in company with the wicked; and with great frequency holds him up as the type of the great ensnarer and oppressor of souls. If then these are not sufficient to prove to any man that there could lawfully be no slaves in Israel to release at the Jubilee, that man is not to be convinced by arguments adapted to his understanding; and to argue with his lusts is a hopeless business. The next inquiry is, how was it in regard to the Hebrew servants?

II. *The Jubilee did not release Hebrew servants.* Their freedom was provided for by another statute. "If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve; and in the seventh

year he shall go out free for nothing," Ex. xxi, 2: Deut. xv, 12.

III. *The Jubilee did release all servants who were strangers.* There are three classes noticed in the concluding regulations of this ordinance all from the same stock, viz: Those immediately from the Heathen round about, those who had been some time sojourning in the land, and children of sojourners. These were the only servants whom it remained for the jubilee to release.

The typical meaning of this release, when received in connection with a year of rest, is obvious. As already stated, it was the Savior's pledge to all his servants, that when they shall have finished the work their masters have assigned them on earth, they shall be called to the enjoyment of everlasting rest in Heaven, through the merits of the true atonement for sin. With all the blessedness of a pious mind, and notwithstanding the delight which every faithful servant of Jesus Christ finds in his master's work, he "would not live alway." "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." The expectation of being shortly with his Redeemer, in

those mansions which he has gone to prepare in his Father's house, is called emphatically *that blessed hope*. It is this that cheers the Christian under his sufferings, and makes his present afflictions appear light and but for a moment. It was this that sustained the patriarch Job, when all his earthly comforts had forsaken him, and his nearest friends were tormenting him. "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day, upon the earth; and though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." It is right that it should be so. It was *for the joy set before him*, that Jesus *endured the cross, despising the shame*. It was a matter of course that for a blessedness, so much desired, there should be some symbolical pledge among the prominent ordinances of the Sinai covenant. Accordingly, in the release of the Hebrew servant just alluded to, we see the pledge that the death of believing Hebrews shall be their introduction to the enjoyment of an eternal Sabbath in Heaven. The remaining question, and the one in which we are personally and deeply interested, is, "Does the same blessedness await the Gentile believer?" This

question is answered in the command, "proclaim liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof."

We can not close our remarks on this part of our subject, without noticing a most humiliating proof of the badness of the human heart. More than two thousand years ago, the unbelieving Jews conspired to cut off the Gentile world from the blessings of the jubilee; and soon after the commencement of the slave-trade, a large proportion of Christendom joined the conspiracy. Both would rob the Gentiles, one would filch from them their temporal, the other their spiritual liberty. It is worth while to notice how a combination of sinners so unlike, and so hostile to each other, in some respects, can be affected by a common principle; and though they may not be friendly enough to walk in the same path, they can arrive at the same result by a different route. It matters not whether we attribute the right to the privileges of the typical or anti-typical atonement. Types and anti-types are equally extensive in their application, and mutually explain and illustrate each other.

The unbelieving Jew admits that stranger

shared in the typical blessings of the typical atonement. He would put out of the synagogue the man who would say the "heathen round about" means descendants of Abraham. But in the face of all correct interpretation of type and anti-type, he denies their right to the blessing secured by the true atonement. He insists that the Gentile nations are to be forever accursed. Without abandoning one of his favorite dreams, he can not admit that their salvation was any part of Messiah's errand into the world. He supposes that the glorious work which he is to accomplish is, putting the neck of the Gentiles under the feet of the Jews. His highest conception of earthly bliss is living in a ceiled house, in the enjoyment of ease and affluence, and looking down with contempt on the Gentile world perishing without a Savior—a sight which a devil could enjoy for its own sake, and a Pharisee for its worldly profit.

The slaveholding Christian insists that the Jews are wrong in excluding Gentile sinners from the blessings typified by the privileges proclaimed by the jubilee trumpet. He would inflict the highest censures of the church on the man who would propagate such damnable here-

sy. And then he will indirectly preach that same heresy, by contending that Gentile servants had no share in that typical liberty proclaimed on the morning of the jubilee. He sees that the moment he admits that the servitude of the Gentile servants was not perpetual, he must abandon his favorite argument, miserable as it is, for holding the Africans in perpetual slavery.

There is no passage of scripture which so kindles the fury of infidel Jews and slaveholding Christians, as the ordinance of the jubilee when faithfully expounded. In the days of our Savior it was attended with the jeopardy of the minister's life; and so it is now. A more frightful scene was never witnessed, than that which is noticed in the history of our Lord's first sermon at Nazareth. He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath as his custom was, and took for his text Isaiah lxi, 1, 2, "the spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the

Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn." *By the day of vengeance of our God*, is obviously meant that day typified by the day of atonement, when God should take vengeance on sin, and bruise the serpent's head through the sufferings of his Son. By the *acceptable year of the Lord* is intended the great jubilee typified by every fiftieth year when Messiah by the Gospel trumpet should proclaim the glad tidings of the atonement to all who are designated by the *meek, the broken hearted*, and those who are *bound in prison*. The evangelist Luke (ch. iv, 21) suggests the sum and drift of the discourse by a single sentence of the introduction. *This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears*. The amount seems to have been that their preacher was that great High Priest who was to make the true offering for sin. He was the true anointed one who, with his own lips and by the heralds of his cross, was to proclaim pardon and salvation to all who were laboring under the effects of sin. It seems the congregation were delighted when Jesus expounded the *acceptable year of the Lord*, and the *day of vengeance of our God*; and especially when he

unfolded the blessings of the atonement for the poor, the broken hearted, the captives and the prisoners. All who heard him "bare witness and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his lips." But the mere circumstance that a people admire and praise a preacher, is no evidence that they are edified. Generally it only proves that their self-complacency has not been disturbed. The evangelist suggests that in this instance there were two principles which kept them in a good humor. In the first place, they had very little personal regard for the preacher. Even Jesus was not an exception to the maxim—*no prophet is accepted in his own country*. In the second place, they took for granted, that being descendants of Abraham these blessings were exclusively for them. Among other means of cherishing this delusion, they had a long string of misapplied proverbs which they always took with them to the synagogue, viz: "Abraham is our father;" "it is not meet to take the childrens' bread and cast it to dogs; Messiah is not sent but to the lost sheep of the *house of Israel*." Our Savior noticed another at their tongue's end which he anticipates, "you will

surely say unto me—*physician heal thyself.*” The spirit of it seems to have been, that a physician must not be lavish of his medicines and skill. He must take special care of himself and friends. They took for granted therefore, that according to this maxim, the blessings he had been preaching were for them; and that he would amuse them with a repetition of all the mighty works done in Capernaum. But he proceeds in his sermon to show that the true blessings of the jubilee are the blessings of a sovereign God for all who are poor, broken hearted, etc., whether Jews or Gentiles. To sustain this view, he quotes facts recorded in the Old Testament as presages of the future extension of Messiah’s blessings to all nations. “Many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the Heavens were shut up for three years and six months, when great famine was throughout all the land. But unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman who was a widow. And many lepers were in Israel in the days of Elisha the prophet, and none of them were cleansed save Naaman the Syrian.” In a moment all was uproar and confusion. An intima-

tion that the Gentiles were to be saved by the sovereign grace of God ; and that they were not to be put under the feet of the Jews as tributaries ; and that the Jew with all his external privileges might die a reprobate, was intolerable. “And they were all filled with wrath, and rose up and thrust him out of the city, and led him to the brow of the hill whereon the city was built, that they might cast him down headlong.”

Let a minister in the South take the jubilee for his text, and expound it as faithfully and fearlessly as our Lord did ; let him show that it proclaims, not slavery, but the blessings of the new covenant for the African ; and another miracle will be necessary to save his life.

But our fanaticism far outstrips that of the infidel Jews. They would seem to gain something by their heretical exposition, but we would gain nothing, and lose every thing. It would not make us slaveholders, but abject slaves. We are Gentiles. If the moral principle embodied in the ordinance of the jubilee was the perpetual slavery of the Gentiles by the Jews, we must look out some man in whose veins the blood of Abraham flows, and tell him that we are his rightful property.

But the enslavement of us and our offspring is not the worst result. If the typical atonement procured no release for Gentile servants, if they had no share in the Sabbath of the jubilee, in vain do Gentile servants of the Lord Jesus expect rest with their Master in Heaven when called by death from his service on earth. And all Gentile believers "who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished." Hence the damning guilt attached by the prophets to those who had converted the servitude which God had instituted into a system of oppression, and when they heard the trumpet of the jubilee, refused to break the yoke to pieces that it might never be used again. Isaiah lviii, 6; Jeremiah xxxiv. That sin made the fasts of the jubilee and of the annual atonement a stench in the nostrils of the Almighty. In addition to its infraction of the law, and its cruelty to the oppressed, it was holding up two frightful heresies, viz: That the atonement secured to believers the privilege of being manstealers or oppressors—and that there is no rest in Heaven for the stranger who believes in Jesus.

V. *The atonement secured to all landholders the right of redeeming inheritances sold on ac-*

count of poverty ; and the restoration of such as had not been redeemed. "It shall be a jubilee unto you : and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family," Levit. xxv, 10.

The common term for these possessions is *inheritances*. They are so called because they were assigned to the several families by the ordinance of the *lot*, and were formerly taken possession of through the blood of sacrifice. One of the first things that Israel was to do after crossing Jordan was, to offer burnt offerings, and peace offerings, and then take possession of the land, Deut. xxvii, 6. Thus, in reference to both typical and anti-typical Canaan, they publicly acknowledged what Moses told them in his farewell address : "Understand that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess for thy righteousness, for thou art a stiff-necked people."

To ascertain what *good things* those possessions typified, we have only to inquire, what is that *good thing* which God bestows freely through the blood of his Son, and which is called *our inheritance*? The answer obviously is—Heaven. Hence, in the last day, the Judge will

welcome the redeemed to the enjoyment of mansions prepared for them in the heavenly Canaan, by saying, "Come ye blessed of my father *inherit* the kingdom prepared for you," etc.

Heaven is the inheritance of him who as God in our nature is called the Son of God, the Son of Man, the Only Begotten of the Father, our Elder Brother, the First Born among many brethren, etc. As God he was Lord of all worlds. But as God in our nature he obtained dominion over his inheritance by a work more glorious, than that of making worlds. "When he had by himself purged our sins he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high—being so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." Heb. i, 3, 4. The typical atonement restored the elder brother to his typical inheritance. So the true atonement restored our elder brother to the enjoyment of his inheritance, and to all that dominion expressed by *sitting down at the right hand of the Majesty on high.*

Heaven is also the inheritance of all who are united with him by regeneration and true faith in his blood. Being baptised into the body of

Christ by the Holy Spirit, he is their elder brother, they are his younger brethren. He is the heir in law of all the inheritance; *they are joint heirs with Christ*; 1 Pet. i, 4.

From this view if types and anti-types mutually explain and illustrate each other, we may safely infer: First—the first born son in Israel was heir of all his father's possessions; and the younger brethren had no possession separately and independently of their elder brother. In other words, it was only through him that they could have any interest in their father's possession. Second—no possession was affected by the jubilee excepting those which belonged to typical persons; such as the first born, and those who were invested with some of the privileges of the birthright. These two positions we shall endeavor to sustain.

1. *The elder brother was the heir, in law, of all his father's land.* Daughters had no possession excepting when their father died without a son. In that case the land was theirs, but when they married it became the possession of their husband. Numb. xxxvi, 11. We do not say that younger brothers had no interest in their father's possession. On the contrary, it was the

home of all the family. There, under their brother, they enjoyed protection, and instruction and relief when any of them had waxen poor and fallen into decay. What the terms were on which they lived with him on the inheritance, or how its profits were shared, it would be foreign from our present purpose to inquire. See our Lord's parable, Matt. xxi, 28—46.

The opinion, that the inheritance at the father's death was equally divided among the sons, excepting that the eldest had twice as much as either of the others, and that their several interests were held separately and independently, is untenable. We have only to look at the anti-type in the light of the New Testament to see its absurdity. Are we taught that Heaven will be equally divided among the redeemed and their Savior, excepting that he will have twice as much as either of them? Such a supposition shocks us. But if types are not intended to deceive, this would seem to be the necessary result of the theory we are opposing. No; Heaven is the inheritance of our Elder Brother; and we have no interest but through him; and no inconvenience will be felt

there from this arrangement. He has the dominion and in all things the pre-eminence. So it was in the typical Canaan. The first born was the heir; the younger sons had no interest but through him. We never read of an attempt to divide an inheritance among brothers, excepting when one applied to our Lord to command his brother to make a division, and the reply was a solemn lecture on the sin of covetousness. Luke xii, 13. The parable of the prodigal seems to be predicated on the principles of the law. The younger brother had his portion in goods and the elder was the heir of the possession—precisely the division which Abraham made of his riches among his sons. Gen. xxv, 5.

The first born under both the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations was peculiarly *the Lord's*. He had the dominion, or was the ruler. Hence the name of ruler is *an elder*—not necessarily an old man, but older than his brethren. He succeeded his father in the priesthood, and inherited the possession. Reuben was the first born among the patriarchs, but his father on his death-bed deposed him for the crime of incest. Gen. xlix, 3, 4. Subsequently the priesthood with all the service of the tabernacle was

given to Levi, the dominion to Judah, and the heirship of the inheritance (called sometimes emphatically *the birth-right*) to Joseph, 1 Chron. v, 1, 2.

Jacob was richer when he died than his fathers Abraham and Isaac. They were all heirs of the holy land. *But he gave them none inheritance, no not so much as to set their foot on.* As to ownership or actual possession, they were distinctly informed that even their seed should not have it until they had sojourned in a foreign land four hundred years. But Jacob did, both by purchase and conquest, become the owner of land. On comparing Gen. xxxviii, 22, with Josh. xxiv, 32, it appears that he had bought of Hamor, the father of Shechem a tract of land for a hundred pieces of silver, and afterward when deprived of it by the Amorites, he recovered it with his sword and bow. It also appears that he did not divide it among his sons, but gave all to Joseph. This legacy of all his father's land is the *birth-right* spoken of (in 1. Cron. v, 1, 2) as having been given to Joseph in consequence of the fall of Reuben.*

* The arrangement assigning to Ephraim and Manasseh each a portion of the holy land equal to that of any of

When the promised land was divided by lot under the ministry of Joshua, the lot was not cast on this *parcel of ground*. It belonged to Joseph. And as Ephraim, though the younger by birth (Gen. xlviii, 5) had been installed as elder, at the time of his adoption by his grand father, it was his of course.

But how does it come that all the land was not given to Joseph's family when they crossed the river Jordan to take possession? The answer is, the birth-right possession which he inherited in consequence of the fall of his brother Reuben entitled him to no more than the tract just mentioned. That was all his father owned.

Besides, on the night on which they left Egypt to take possession of the country promised to the seed of Abraham, God set apart every first born son in Israel to inherit as an elder. "All the first born are mine, for in the day that I smote the first born in the land

their father's brethren, when the holy land was divided, had no connection with the birth-right. It was the result of their having been adopted by their grandfather as his sons that they might inherit even as Simeon and Reuben. Gen. xlviii.

of Egypt, I hallowed unto me all the first born in Israel, both man and beast, mine they shall be, I am the Lord." Numb. iii, 13.

The erection of the tabernacle was a new era in the history of the worship of God. Taking care of it, and its furniture, and assisting the priests in the service of the sanctuary, devolved of course on those who by the blood of the paschal lamb had been set apart as the elder brother. But by the special command of God, this privilege was transferred to the sons of Levi. "Thou shalt bring the Levites before the Lord, and the children of Israel shall put their hands upon the Levites. And Aaron shall offer the Levites before the Lord for an offering of the children of Israel that they may execute the service of the Lord; Numb viii, 10. Thus it appears that when Israel reached the promised land, the first born were in possession of only two birth-right privileges—the ownership of the land and the dominion over it. The other was in the possession of the Levites.

Here it is necessary to notice the phrase *a double portion* (Deut. xxi, 17), a wrong interpretation of which has led some to adopt the notion that the elder had just twice as much.

land as the younger son. The object of the text in the connection in which it is used is, to prevent partiality in disposing of the birth-right in case of a second marriage. It provides that in case the first wife was hated he shall not transfer the birth-right to the son of the other—"But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first born by giving him a *double portion* of all he hath." Now it is manifestly unfair to undertake to decide what was the law respecting the birth-right, from a text not professing to give the law, but simply containing an allusion to it, in a prohibition of partiality among children.

Besides a *double portion* is an indefinite phrase used to express the idea of a *prominent portion*. The apostle enjoins (1 Tim. v, 17) that those elders who rule well and also labor in word and doctrine should be counted worthy of *double honor*—evidently not just twice as much honor as those who merely rule. Elisha prayed that a double portion of the spirit of Elijah might rest upon him. 2. Kings ii, 9. His prayer was not that he might have just twice as much piety, or twice as much of the holy spirit as his master had. His desire was,

that when he should be called to stand at the head of the sons of the prophets, in consequence of his master being taken up to heaven, that *prominent portion* of the spirit which qualified Elijah, might rest upon him. 2 Kings ii, 9.

Besides a variety of phrases are used to express the portion of the first born. In Deut. xxi, 17, it is a *double portion of all that he (the father) hath*. In Gen. xxv, 5: in reference to Isaac it is *all that he (Abraham) had*. In Gen. xlviii, 22, in reference to Reuben and Joseph who succeeded him as heir of his father's land, it is called a *portion above thy brethren*. All dispute on this subject is cut short by the fact that Jacob gave all his land to Joseph; and the law in reference to this matter was the same under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations.

2. *No possessions were affected by the jubilee excepting such as belonged to typical persons.* It had no influence on property in fenced cities. "If it be not redeemed within the space of a full year, then the house that is in the walled city shall be established for ever to him that bought it throughout his generation, it shall not go out in the jubilee," xxv, 30.

The reason evidently was, it was not necessarily the possession of one invested with any of the birth-right privileges, and therefore was not a proper type of the inheritance of our elder brother. The fenced cities were the military towns with high walls and bars and gates, supplied with military stores and inhabited by men of value. The property in these cities was often held by younger brethren and pious strangers. Jehoshaphat, disposing of his younger sons according to the law, "gave them gifts of silver and of gold, and of precious things with fenced cities in Judah, but the kingdom gave he to Jehoram because he was the first born:" 2 Chron. xxi, 3. But Rehoboam for the purpose of dispossessing his eldest son of the dominion to which he was entitled by the law of birth-right, gave him the portion of a younger son—property in fenced cities and other things. His object was to give a younger son by the daughter of Absalom the dominion. "Rehoboam loved Maachah the daughter of Absalom above all his wives and concubines, and Rehoboam made Abijah the son of Maachah the chief to be ruler among his brethren, for he thought to make him king. And

he dealt wisely and disposed of all his children throughout all the countries of Judah and Benjamin unto every fenced city, and he gave them victuals in abundance." 2 Chron. xi, 21.

But the jubilee did restore to their original owners, if not previously redeemed, all the cities of the priests and Levites, and all houses in villages without walls, and all the fields or land. Read Levit. xxv, 29-34.

From a review of this article it appears that there were four classes of Israelites, each invested with some of the privileges of the birth-right. They were thus types of Jesus Christ, and their inheritances types of his inheritance; of course they went out in the jubilee.

1. The rulers of the tribe of Judah. The dominion forfeited by Reuben was assigned to them. It was subsequently lodged in the family of David. Hence David is a typical name of Christ our King; and the house of David is the name of the kingdom of our Lord. These rulers had lands assigned them, some of them were much devoted to husbandry. Their possessions if sold, and not redeemed, were restored by the jubilee atonement.

2. The sons of Aaron who were called

(Ex. xxviii, 1) to the work of the priesthood forfeited by Reuben.

3. The Levites to whom by divine command the first born transferred the privilege of assisting the priests. To them with the priests were assigned forty-eight cities to dwell in, with suburbs reaching one thousand cubits from the wall on every side "for their cattle and for their goods, and for all their beasts," and two thousand cubits for pasturage: Numb. xxxv, 4-7. The fields of their suburbs could not be sold; and their houses and cities if sold might at any time be redeemed, if not redeemed they went out in the jubilee.

4. The first born who were all types of Jesus. The reversion of their inheritances was secured by the atonement on the morning of the jubilee.

There were three regulations to secure possessions to their original owners, which deserve particular attention. The land could not be sold forever—when sold it might at any time be redeemed, if not redeemed it went out in the jubilee.

1. "The land can not be sold forever, for the land is mine, for ye are strangers and sojourn-

ers with me. And in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a redemption for the land." The phrase here translated *forever*, is marginally rendered for *cutting off* or to be *quite cut off*. The meaning is, the original owner shall not lose his right of property, nor even the enjoyment of it, excepting for a time. It is explained by the provision—he may redeem—if not redeemed it shall go out in the jubilee. The land was God's. When he in the person of the Son assigned the tribes their inheritances by lot, he did not give them the power of alienating. They were to consider themselves as sojourners on his land. "For the land is mine, for ye are strangers and sojourners with me," xxv, 23. They were his tenants placed there not merely for their own comfort, but also for the glory of the proprietor, and to promote the welfare of all who should be placed under their dominion.

Our present concern is not with the secular advantage of this arrangement; but with its typical meaning. It illustrates and defines the dominion of the Son of God, our elder brother, over all his possession. When we learn that he has obtained all power over

heaven and earth, through the blood typified by that through which Israel took possession of Canaan, after they crossed Jordan, and by that blood on the morning of the jubilee, through which they returned every man to his possession; what is the meaning? Not that the father has surrendered all property in his own dominion. Not that he retired from all concern in the government, and salvation, and judgment of his own world. All this is the work of the triune God, but it is carried on by him who is God in our nature. He is prophet, priest, and king, elder brother, redeemer, kinsman, and all that is implied in any of those numerous titles worn by those typical persons who inherited the birth-right. All these offices he will execute to the glory of God, and the salvation of his younger brethren, and the final destruction of all his and their enemies. "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shalt the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."—1 Cor. xv, 28.

2. The land might be sold under the provision already noticed, when poverty made it

necessary. "If thy brother be waxen poor, etc." Necessity, induced by poverty, seems to have been the only justifiable plea. Esau could sell forever all the privileges of the birth-right; but he was a *profane person*. His delight was in hunting, and one of his highest enjoyments seems to have been eating *that same red pottage*. But no true Israelite would part with his possession even for a time, unless poverty made it necessary. He prized it not only as the inheritance assigned to his fathers by lot, but also as the symbol and pledge of a better inheritance. It was worthy of such a king as Ahab, to propose to one of his subjects to sell his vineyard—"that I may have it for a garden of herbs, because it is near unto my house, and I will give thee a better vineyard than it, or if it seems good to thee, I will give thee the worth of it in money"—1 Kings xxi, 2. Naboth, no doubt, knew the probable consequence of incurring the tyrant's displeasure, and especially of rousing the wrath of that *woman Jezebel*. But he rejected the proposal with indignation—"The Lord forbid it me, that I should give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee." And the refusal cost him his life.

But "justice and judgment are the habitation of the throne of God." And in all God's dominions, the claims of justice are paramount. It is only when Satan reigns that righteous claims must bow to expediency. If an Israelite waxed poor, no matter how that poverty was induced, if he could not otherwise pay his debts, or comply with all lawful requirements, he must part with his inheritance. This imperfectly illustrates the sternness of that justice which required the Son of God, when he became our security, and then for our sakes became poor, to leave his heavenly inheritance. He must leave the bosom of his heavenly father, the society of angels, and the joys of Heaven, never to return, until the blood of the true atonement, or the true work of redemption, should procure liberty, to return again to his possession. But here the type is imperfect. The elder brother in Israel might have to part with his inheritance through his own fault. It might be in consequence of debts contracted in relieving some poor brother, an Israelite or stranger, or it might be the result of his own folly and dissipation. But our elder brother had no sins of his own. He

was made of a woman, made under the law. In a miraculous way he became man, and by an extraordinary constitution was subjected to a law which had no claims on his person.

Thus he inherited no pollution from man; and he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." But for us he became poor; our iniquities were laid upon him. And the way in which he saved himself and all his younger brethren, was typified by the way in which the poor Israelite was enabled to return to his inheritance.

3. *The inheritance when sold might be redeemed.*—"If any of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem that which his brother sold. And if the man have none to redeem it, and himself be able to redeem it; then let him count the years of the sale thereof, and restore the surplus unto the man to whom he sold, that he may return unto his possession." xxv, 25. To redeem a thing is not to buy it. It is to *buy it back*, or deliver it from thralldom, by substituting in its place, at least an equivalent. The worth of the use of the inheritance until the jubilee was to be put into the hands of him who bought, and then it was redeemed.

It is in allusion to those typical redemptions, sometimes by mercy, sometimes by blood, that Jesus is said to have redeemed us, by shedding his own blood in the room of our blood—by giving his life for ours—by bearing the wrath of God in our room.

4. If the inheritance sold on account of poverty were not previously redeemed, the atonement secured to the owner the right of returning and taking possession of it. That this was typical of the exaltation of our elder brother, through the blood of his sacrifice for sin, needs no proof. In allusion to the proclamation by sound of trumpet on the morning of the jubilee that the atonement was made, and therefore every man might return to his inheritance, our Lord on the morning of the resurrection is represented as proclaiming the decree of his exaltation to the dominion over his father's inheritance through the blood of the atonement. "I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee"—Ps. ii, 7. There are no psalms in which the feelings of the author appear to be more elevated above their ordinary pitch than those in which the ascension

of the risen Redeemer is celebrated. The 47th psalm, written for the Levites, the sons of Korah, seems to have been sung as one of the favorite psalms on the day of atonement and on the morning of the jubilee. "God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of the trumpet. Sing praises to our God, sing praises, sing praises to our king, sing praises." The burst of joy throughout the land, when the trumpet proclaimed the atonement and its typical privileges but faintly symbolized that which Isaiah predicted when Messiah by the heralds of the cross, should proclaim the glad tidings of his exaltation as king. The prophet uses allusion to some of those occasions like that of the battle between Joab and Absalom in the word of Ephraim, which was to decide the question whether the typical David should reign or perish. All who were interested in the welfare of their king waited the result at a distance—his watchmen were on their towers; they observed with intense anxiety the footsteps of every runner who made his appearance that they might ascertain whether he were friend or foe, eagerly listening for "all is well" or the opposite, should it be so: 2 Sam. xviii.

So when Jesus took our place, that law and justice might have their full sweep, and when he had to contend with all the powers of darkness, the prophet Isaiah represents Zion and her children, as awaiting at a distance the result of the battle of the cross and the grave. How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, "*thy God reigneth.*"

IV.—*The atonement secured relief for Israelites and pious strangers who had waxen poor and fallen into decay.*

"If thy brother be waxen poor and fallen into decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him, yea, though he be a stranger or a sojourner, that he may live with thee. Take thou no usury or increase, but fear thy God that thy brother may live with thee. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase. I am the Lord thy God"—xxv, 35-38. The reason why they might not take usury (interest) or increase of any kind of a brother, an Israelite or stranger living among them, which they might of a foreigner, is evident: Deut. xxiii, 20. The

Jewish nation were not a commercial people; other nations were. To take more for an article than it is worth, or more than the circumstances of a poor man under a government so peculiar, would justify, would be unkind and unjust. It would be inconsistent with the feelings which the proper influence of the atonement produces, and unlike the spirit of our elder brother. They were to lend to the poor and feeble, not only without the hope of gain, but with the probability of having to forgive the debt in the year of release.

This command is addressed particularly, though not exclusively, to those who were returning to their possessions. The poor brother is fallen into decay *with thee*. You must relieve him that he may *dwell with thee*. These phrases are used (verse 23) to express the condition of one who lives on the land of another. Ye are strangers and *sojourners with me*. But the elders were to see that all within their respective gates, manifested the same spirit.

The return of the Levites, and priests, and elders, to their possessions through the merits of the typical expiation, and the ascension of our

High priest and king, through his own blood, are parallel events. The one was the shadow of the other. The Israelite relieving his poor brethren with money and victuals, and clothing, symbolized those refreshing times which commenced on the day of Pentecost, when the spirit was poured out on Jews and proselytes, until eight thousand who, but a little while before, were poor and perishing for the bread of life, were rejoicing and happy. Hence God speaks with abhorrence of those heinous offenses which were calculated to make the day of atonement and the jubilee hateful, "Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to my house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh"—Isaiah lviii, 7. The neglecters of these duties slandered the Messiah. They positively insinuated that he would ascend to his father, exclusively for his own comfort—to look down without concern on a perishing world.

It was a beautiful illustration of the practical influence of the atonement, to see the congregation searching out those who had

waxen poor and fallen into decay, to relieve them, without hope of earthly gain. The apostle James mentions, as peculiar to the religion of the Bible, that it teaches "to visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction." No one has ever seen an institution for the relief of the poor, the stranger, the fatherless, or the widow, where the atonement was unknown. What is the reason that a heathen is proverbially revengeful? Why is a nominal Christian, when he feels himself to be injured, uniformly cold-blooded, and unforgiving? Why is it, that he can look on a neighbor of a different color in distress, without pity? How has it come to pass, that he can hear of his fellow-immortals groaning by millions in slavery, forcibly deprived of the means of salvation, without pity, and even with a spirit of determined opposition to every scheme for their relief? The reason (not his apology) is, his heart is a stranger to the influence of the atonement. Where that influence is not felt there is, strictly speaking, no such thing as *mercy* among men. No man, but he who has felt his dependence on the blood of atonement, can sincerely and safely pray that prayer,

“forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.” It is worthy of remark that the word used by our Lord and his apostles and some of the prophets, to express *mercy*, and the term *propitiation* are kindred terms. The reason is, that to be *merciful*, to the miserable or guilty is neither more nor less than to deal with them according to the merits of the *propitiation*. When the publican prays *God be merciful to me a sinner*, (*hilastheti moi*) his meaning is, *deal with me according to the propitiation*. The man who professes to build his hopes of heaven on the *propitiation*, and in the meantime can take his brother, *yea though he be a stranger*, by the throat, because poverty and the law of the land have put him in his power, belies his profession. The man who can drive a stranger, and especially a brother in Christ, out of the house of God, and out of the land, because his complexion does not suit him, is a scandal to the Christian name. The law in Israel was: “If thy brother be waxen poor and falling into decay then thou shalt release him; *yea, though he be a stranger or sojourner, that he may live with thee.*” Any body of men who

would have put in operation a scheme for violently transporting and putting them ashore on a foreign coast, because they were poor and despised, would have been cut off by the highest censures of the church.

The Savior's yoke is always light and pleasant to those who have his spirit. To one who knew the worth of souls, and supremely desired the glory of his Savior, it was pleasant to meet, with food and raiment, the stranger who had come from a far country to hear the way of salvation. But to that class of professors whose religion was mere orthodoxy, and placed their happiness in their own lust, it was intolerable that these strangers should not only live with them, but be relieved without interest when fallen into decay.

In the first place, the law made no difference as to character, or clime, or color. The holy land was on the borders of Africa; most of the nations around were exceedingly vile in their habits; nearly all of them had at different times grievously oppressed Israel; but a religion which cherishes prejudices, arising from such considerations, will not save the soul.

The difficulty with the Israelites would be

forgetting the injuries which they had suffered from the nations from whence these strangers came. We can clearly see that this would be wicked. Our difficulty would be the *color* of some of them. From one end of our country to the other, with exceptions here and there, we have shut the doors of our school-houses against them, and driven them to a far corner of the house of God. We do it religiously, and yet it is very remarkable that we can not agree in our apologies. When we come to state our reasons, they are as diversified and contradictory as the testimony of the witnesses who were suborned for the condemnation of our Savior.

In the free States the difficulty is the *presence of the Africans*. We are opposed to slavery. We can hardly think of those who hold the Africans as property and degrade them to a level with the brutes, without thinking of the wrath which is coming. But their complexion and *smell* make their presence intolerable, and therefore they can not live with us.

In the slave States the presence of Africans is no inconvenience whatever. The people of a fair complexion were nursed by Africans in childhood, and hushed to sleep in their bosoms.

Black people were their cooks, their waiters at table, and their attendants at the bed-side during sickness. They can not see how people in the free States get along without the *presence* of the Africans. *Their* difficulty is the elevation of the Africans. It shocks them to think of the degraded wretches being raised to a level with themselves. And lest this should one day be the result, they must be converted into missionaries, and put ashore on the coast of Africa. The only thing we agree in is, they must not be liberated to *live among us*. Had Israel possessed our spirit, the statute before us would have produced mobs from Dan to Beersheba.

It does not appear that any Israelite from the king to the priest experienced any inconvenience from the color of the strangers among them, though many of them were Africans, and many others were Ethiopians. An Ethiopian (Cushi) does not necessarily mean an *African*; but it does mean a *black person*. See Jeremiah xiii, 23. The only instance recorded in the history of the Jewish nation, of Israelites being disturbed by the complexion of those around them, is the case of Miriam who, with Aaron, "spake against Moses, because of the

Ethiopian woman he had married." Numb. xii, 1. Moses had married the daughter of Jethro, the priest of Midian, a descendant of Abraham by Keturah. It appears from Habakuk iii, 7, that the Midianites were Cushites of Ethiopians. The objection of Miriam is both amusing and instructive. It confirms a remark often made, that opposition to the emancipation of the Africans on account of their color, does not necessarily imply a fair complexion on the part of the objectors. The first mob we ever saw arrayed against the friends of the black man, were such a dark looking crew, that it would have been difficult for a stranger to decide to which of the races most of them belonged. The fact that they could bear with one another, showed that the outcry against color was used as a mere covering. So it was with Miriam. Her own face was not so very fair for she had been a slave in Egypt where the sun takes great liberty with the complexion. But in the preceding chapter we see the occasion of all the difficulty. In consequence of advice received by Moses from his father-in-law, seventy elders were ordained. Miriam was affronted that she and Aaron were passed by,

and she *took on* so highly about it as to express doubts whether Moses had any more pretensions to inspiration than she and Aaron. She insinuated that in this whole business he was governed by his wife and her connections, and the best proof she could think of, was, not that their sister-in-law was a Midianitess, for she and the Midianites were cousins, but she had a *dark complexion*. The history of this whole affair is hung up in the Bible as a looking-glass for hypocrites in every age. And let that minister of the gospel who can stand a whole Sabbath in preaching that it is right to degrade their brethren to a level with the brutes, because their complexion is dark, take for his text the conclusion of the history of this matter. It seems that Miriam was made whiter than she wished to be. *The anger of the Lord was kindled. And Miriam became leprous, white as snow*—and she was shut out of the camp seven days. We never hear any more difficulty in all the history of Israel about the *color* of any brother or stranger.

We see Ethiopians in the palaces of kings, and some of them the most influential and respectable men there. There was no man in the

court of Zedekiah of as much virtue or influence as Ebed-melech the Ethiopian. When all the courtiers had conspired for the destruction of Jeremiah, and cast him into a dungeon so filthy as to endanger his life, he interfered, and after fairly representing his case to the king, he took a guard of thirty men, and delivered him. For this kindness shown to a good man, the Lord sent Jeremiah with a message to him, assuring him that amidst all the confusion and slaughter in taking the city by the Chaldeans, he should be safe. Jer. xxxviii, 6, 7, and xxxix, 15-18.

It does not disturb the conscience of Philip to sit beside the prime minister of the queen of Candace to expound to him the way of salvation. Nor did it disturb the devotion of the great apostle of the Gentiles that among those who laid their hands upon him was "Simeon that is called *Niger*," i. e. *black man*. Acts xiii, 1.

In the second place, the strangers whom the Israelites had to relieve were numerous. We shall notice only three classes.

1. Those who left their kindred and country for the sake of the means of grace. A mixed multitude went up with Israel from Egypt, Ex.

xii, 38, and when they returned from Babylon. Neh. xiii, 3. Such accessions from the heathen are subjects of frequent prophesy. Isaiah xiv, 1. The language of Moses to Hobab breathes the spirit of all pious Israelites to their fellow-sinners wherever they meet them; "Come with us and we will do you good," etc. There is scarcely a prayer in the Old Testament, for a revival in the church, in which the heathen are forgotten. Frequently the great argument accompanying the petition is in substance the same with that in the 67th Psalm—"that thy way may be known upon the earth, and thy saving health among all nations." The temple was built as *an house of prayer for all nations*. In the prayer by Solomon at its dedication we see the feelings of pious Jews and the spirit of their law toward strangers; "moreover concerning the stranger which is not of thy people Israel, but is come from a far country for thy name's sake, and thy mighty hand, and thy stretched out arm, if they come and pray in this house, then hear thou from the heavens even from thy dwelling-place, and do according to all that the stranger calleth to thee for; that all people of the earth may know thy name, and

fear thee as doth thy people of Israel." 2 Chron. vi, 32. Pious strangers would wish to reside in the Holy Land. It is true that we have Christians who for the sake of increasing their property can leave the gospel and settle among the heathen. But they have the apology that the gospel will follow them. Strangers in heathen lands under the Old Testament could have no such hope; and in many instances conversion to the religion of the Bible, made it necessary to flee to the Holy Land to save their lives. Hence on the day of Pentecost we find devout men from every nation under Heaven, proselytes as well as Jews living in Jerusalem.

2. Another interesting class of strangers was the widows and fatherless from the heathen. The law forbade taking captive those whom they conquered in wars with their oppressors. Deut. xx. But the woman and children made widows and fatherless were to be brought home and provided for. This statute served as a check on the war spirit, and provided for a class of human beings for whom there is no mercy among the heathen. The law secured to those with other strangers the gleanings of

every field and vineyard and olive yard, and permission to pass through any field and eat their fill; and the tythe taken up every third year, was for their support and that of the Levites. It was to secure them from the grasp of the manstealer and other oppressors that this terrible threatening was delivered—"Ye shall not afflict any widow or fatherless child. If thou afflict them in any wise, and they at all cry unto me, I will surely hear their cry, and my wrath shall wax hot, and I will kill you with the sword, and your wives shall be widows, and your children fatherless." The fact, that the nations around were slavemakers, and that being whipped in a military fight, or overreached in a bargain so as to be unable to pay a debt, was considered by men sufficient grounds for dooming the unfortunate man with all his descendants to perpetual slavery, made such a threatening necessary.

3. Another numerous class of strangers were slaves who had escaped from their masters. Deut. xv, 16. That those would be numerous is probable when we consider the prevalence of slavery and its oppressive character among the surrounding nations. If our citizens

were bound to protect every runaway we would soon have a crowded population. Considering the ignorance and degradation of these refugees from oppression, they would not always make pleasant neighbors. And it would be a considerable tax that would be necessary to relieve those who were poor. But an Israelite who had just been piously witnessing a typical exhibition of the work by which the Savior was to save him from perishing in his sins, would not be very ready to complain of any sacrifice necessary to the glory of his Redeemer or the welfare of his fellow-men.

They were to open their gates and let these strangers dwell in whatever place they might choose. They were to love them and relieve them in their difficulties. And to make a difference in the treatment of them and their own people on account of the nation from which they came, or on any other account is repeatedly forbidden under penalty of God's displeasure. "If a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself, for ye were strangers in

the land of Egypt; I am the Lord." Lev. xix, 33.

There are two obvious reasons why the authority of God is so frequently brought to bear against the sin here forbidden and why his threatenings are so terrific. One is, *God is good*, and vexing, or in any way oppressing the stranger is a thing which his soul hates, he will not permit it to escape unpunished. Another is, these strangers would be stumbled and prejudiced against God's religion by unkindness on the part of its professors. This accounts for our Lord's indignation when he visited the temple a little before his death. Among all that was wrong there, nothing seemed so to move him, as when he saw the strangers in the court of the Gentiles compelled to stand among the cattle, and the swindling money changers. On no occasion does our Lord's providence look so much like severity. He made a scourge of small cords and drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep and the oxen, and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables, and said: "Is it not written my house shall be called of all nations, the house of prayer? But ye have

made it a den of thieves." What would he have said had he seen the Ethiopian in chains, his back all lacerated with the driver's whip, claimed as the property of the man who was officiating at the altar. *He that hath ears to hear let him hear.*

VII. *The atonement exempted all who were invested with any of the privileges of the birth-right, viz: all landholders, the priests, Levites and elders from the obligations of servants when poverty made it necessary to sell their services.* "And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant," etc. In this verse and others toward the close of the chapter, we have proof that the slaveholding spirit has been in the house of God, trampling over the most sacred thing—he has left the foul print of his feet on our translation of the Scriptures. We shall notice two instances.

1. The word (Obed) which ought always to be translated *servant* is sometimes rendered a *servant*, sometimes a *bond servant*, and sometimes a *bond-man*. Great stress is laid on this English word by those who would make

the Bible justify holding property in man. Yet every school boy who can spell Hebrew, knows that the original means simply *a servant*. He knows moreover that in the original there is no word which of itself means *slave*. They had no use for such a term where the law of Moses ruled—there all servitude was voluntary and limited; and there was no necessity for such a term in reference to Pagan countries—there the law of love was unknown, and servants were generally slaves of course.* How shall we account for it that learned men who can seldom be convicted of a palpable blunder, gravely point to the English word *lord-man* and *bond-servant* as proof that the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan have always been alike, as to the condition of men whose poverty compelled them to labor. Perhaps in some instances it is the result of ignorance, or careless reading. Perhaps in others it is deliberate dishonesty. But there is no necessity for a supposition so unpleasant as the latter. We must remember that it is one of God's standing threatenings, and one of the means

* When we hear of servants in Boston and New Orleans, the terms need no explanation.

by which he urges faithfulness in the exercise of discipline, that if the church will open the door for any gross sin, it shall defile every soul and every means of instruction. Every thing in a leprous house was unclean; and a dead body defiled every person and every uncovered vessel. The leprous spots on our translation bear witness that God is true to this threatening. Four hundred years ago, when the atonement was nearly banished from the churches, and all pity for the heathen with it, African slavery was introduced by the *man of sin*, and placed among the holy institutions. It was there when our translators were born. Learned and pious as they were, they thought it had always been there. And to express all the variety of servitude which existed in their day, they translate the same original word variously—*servant*, *bond-servant*, *bond-man*.

2. The same phrases which in the verse before us (39) is translated *be sold* is in the 47th verse rendered *sell himself*. Now, seeing the original is in both cases the same, why is the translation various? The truth is, they were compelled to admit that, in the latter case, he sold himself; for it appears from the 51st verse

that he received the price of the sale. Then, why not give us the same translation in the 39th verse? That would be admitting that the poor brother instead of being doomed to slavery for his poverty, volutary sold his services himself, and that the compensation was paid to him instead of his neighbors. This would be inconsistent with the universally received opinion, that the slaveholding spirit was as rampant in the house of God under Moses, as in the days of Queen Elizabeth "of most happy memory." Besides, the orders which king James had given respecting alteration of technical terms in the existing translations would make them very cautious.

We here say once for all—that with the exception of such cases as that in which a father sold his daughter as an hand-maid to the man who betrothed her to be his wife, or the wife of his son, Ex. xxi, 7-11, and excepting that in which the magistrate was required to inflict involuntary servitude as a punishment for theft, Ex. xxii, 3, the law of God, by Moses, no where authorized one man to sell another. The person sold was himself the seller, and received the money. We feel

ashamed to say this, with nothing more for the morality and purity of the law which God gave Israel; for it looks like saying that it was not worse than the laws of the most filthy and wicked hordes on the continent of Africa, where selling a brother who has not forfeited his liberty by crime, is punished with death. But our apology is, even this much is denied by theologians of the present day. The passage before us, literally is—*And if thy brother that dwelleth by thee, be waxen poor, and be sold (or sell himself) unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a servant. But as an hired servant or hireling and as a sojourner he shall be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee. And then shall he depart from thee, both he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return. For they are my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, they shall not be sold as servants. Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shalt fear thy God: xxv, 39-43.*

Here we have to encounter another spirit not more modest than that of slaveholding—the spirit of infidelity. The infidel perceives

that he must either abandon his lusts or his Bible. The former he considers too great a sacrifice; and that he may do the latter, with the consent of both his conscience and his neighbors, he raises the cry that there are contradictions in the Scripture, and for proof quotes Exodus xxi, 2, in connection with the passages before us. There it is said, "If thou buy a Hebrew, six years shall he serve, and in the seventh shall he go out free for nothing." But here the statute is, "thou shalt not compel him to serve as a servant," and "he shall serve thee unto the jubilee." Serving six years only, and serving till the fiftieth year, or year of jubilee, are very different things. How are we to reconcile the two statutes? The infidel is sure they are irreconcilable, because the last thing he suspects is his own ignorance. He assumes, that the servitude of the same class of Hebrews is regulated in both places. And truly, if this be admitted, we can not see how the difficulty is to be removed. But there lies the infidel's mistake. They are not only different statutes, but they regulate the services of very different classes of brethren—the younger brethren, and the landholders,

including the elders and priests, Levites and all those who were invested with birth-right privileges, as types of Jesus Christ. In Exodus it is the younger brother who is spoken of and called a *Hebrew man*. Here it is the owner of land, the elder brother is emphatically called *thy brother*—not *thy brother with thee*—the phrase used to designate one who lives on the land of the person addressed (see verse 35, also, the phrase *with me*, verse 23), but *thy brother that dwelleth by thee*, in your neighborhood, on his own land. The former statute had authorized the elder, if a younger brother had become poor and involved, to buy him, i. e., to pay him a sum of money to extricate him from his difficulties, and compensate him for his labors for six years to come, and in the seventh year, in addition to his freedom, and the sum already paid, he was to give him a liberal supply of corn, and wine, and cattle.—Deut. 15. But the statute before us makes provision for the elders, etc., who had fallen into decay. It provides not only that such possessions as had been sold and not redeemed should be restored, but all obligation for any personal service for which they had contracted, should cease. The

reason of all this is plain to any one who has a tolerable acquaintance with the gospel. It was right, that the elder should buy a younger brother when he had fallen into decay, and hold him under obligations to serve out the time for which he paid him. It shadowed forth what Jesus does for his younger brethren, and his claims on them as his servants. It was right too for the elder brother, when he became poor, to serve in any way consistent with the dignity of his office, and the discharge of his various and important duties. This would not be inconsistent with his standing as a type of him who, though rich, for our sakes was to become poor, and take upon him the form of a servant. But to subject the elder brother to the younger, and compel him to serve as a servant, and thus strip him of his high office as elder, kinsman, redeemer, because he was poor, would in itself be unjust; and it would hold up to Israel a heresy. It would say that the humiliation of Jesus would be his deposition from office, and that during the term of his humbled condition, the work of saving sinners would cease.

But infidels have a great deal of trouble with the Bible. It is contended, that if this statute

does not contradict others, it contradicts itself—that it is not good sense to say he may *be sold* and *shall serve unto the jubilee*, and yet, *thou shalt not compel him to serve as a servant*. But all who study carefully the law of Moses, know, that the term *servant* when used technically has two distinct senses. Sometimes it means one who is subject to another as his ruler; sometimes one who is under obligations to labor wholly or principally for another; but *to serve, not as a servant*, is voluntarily to render some services to another, either with or without compensation. In this last sense the elder brother might be sold, i. e., come under obligations for some service which would not interfere with the duties of his office; but in either of the other two senses he could not be a servant. Jesus Christ came to minister to all, but he was the servant of none but his father.

1. A servant, sometimes, means one who is subject to another, as in this sense all younger sons were servants of the first born elder, or magistrate. When Jacob was installed in the birth-right, Isaac says: “Be Lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother’s sons bow down to thee.” And when he informs Esau of that

transaction, he says: "I have made him thy Lord, and all his brethren have I given to him for servants." In this sense, the elder brother according to the statute before us, unless he had forfeited the birth-right, or profanely sold it, as Esau did, could not be compelled to serve as a servant. He was the goal, kinsman, redeemer, revenger, and avenger of blood. And under no enlightened government would such a principle be admitted, as that a brother should be deposed from office, *because he was poor*. But it is in perfect keeping with the slaveholding spirit, to have him reduced to slavery.

2. *A servant* sometimes means one who is under obligations to labor wholly or principally for another, for a fixed term of years, in this sense, younger brethren might become servants of the first born, if they desired it. Such were the servants who went out free in the seventh year. Ex. xxi. But in this sense the elder must neither be compelled nor permitted to serve as a servant. It would be a criminal dereliction of office. The duties of his eldership, were sufficient to fill up most of his time, and forbade him to be under the control of another. He was liable, at any moment, to be called to

the gate to see to the ratification and fairness of important bargains ; Ruth. iv. He had to see that all within his gates were protected, and instructed, that they kept the Sabbath ; that they were living in the discharge of relative duties according to the law. If any were injured in their person and property, he was the kinsman or avenger. If any brother, *yea, though he be a stranger*, had waxed poor and fallen into decay, he was to see that he was supplied with food, and clothing and money without increase. In all good governments, the persons of those who fill important offices, are at times, sacred as regards liability to arrest for debt. For obvious reasons, no man can take the king from his throne, or the legislator from the legislative hall, or the judge from his bench, or a general from the head of his army. The principle here is the same.

3. *To serve* another, is frequently used indefinitely to mean simply rendering to another some service. It does not necessarily imply any inferiority or obligations inconsistent with the duties of the most dignified and important office. The apostle Paul when in pinching circumstances, ministered to his necessities

with his own hands by making tents; and he glories in it, in the same breath with which he asserts his fidelity and devotedness to all the duties of his eldership.

As an hired servant and as a sojourner shall he be with thee, and shall serve thee to the jubilee. We shall not inquire why the word *servant* is in our English translation. Nor shall we inquire whether the advocates of slavery are strictly honest, when they infer from this English word that the law allowed some servants to receive wages, and others to be compelled to labor without wages. The Lord sent Jeremiah to curse the men who would do the latter—Jer. xxii, 13. Our college boys know that the Hebrew word translated *hired servant* is in Malachi, iii, 5, rendered a *hireling*, and in Levit. xix, 13, it is translated, *him that is hired*. A *hireling*, or, if you will, a *hired servant*, is one who has come under obligations for a certain amount of service, or to do a certain job of work. The engagement gives the man who hired him no control over his person or time; it invests him with no power over him, and it implies no inferiority. But in case of failure, he can withhold the promised

wages, or have recourse for damages. Hence the only sin which any one who *hires* another is supposed to be chargeable with, toward the hireling as such, is *oppressing him in his wages*, Mal. iii, 5. And the sum of the duties which the law required toward the hireling as such is prompt payment—"the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning."

As a sojourner shall he be with thee. A *sojourner* is one who lives on the land of another, as a tenant, at will or at most, for one or two years, and pays his landlord for that privilege a certain sum of money, or a certain proportion of the increase of the field. In either of these ways, any officer, from the highest to the lowest, might serve another, without either deposition or dereliction, and without assuming a station which would imply any inferiority. At most it would only indicate that he was poor.

In the 42d and 43d verses, the Lord cautions Israel to beware of every thing like slavery, or compulsory servitude. He reminds them of the terrible judgments inflicted on Egypt, for the sin of slaveholding. He points

to that display of his wrath, as the standing monument of his hatred of the sin of oppression, and as the pledge that similar vengeance shall sooner or later overtake oppressors in time to come.

For they are my servants which I brought out of the land of Egypt, they shall not be sold as servants (bond-men). Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shalt fear thy God.

The phrase *ruling with rigor*, occurs nowhere in the Scriptures excepting this chapter and Exodus i, 13, 14, where it is used to express the bondage to which the Israelites were subjected in Egypt. An important inquiry is, wherein consisted that rigor which in the sight of God was so sinful? The slaveholder's reply would be—"the Egyptians did not use their slaves well; had they driven them gently, as they do in the south, and cracked their whips only when it was necessary to keep them to their work, the Lord would have had no controversy with them." But the phrase *rigor* has respect to the whole system, irrespective of the degree of severity with which it was managed, as appears from the account which Moses gives us. When the sons of

Jacob settled in Goshen, they took their place as keepers of cattle, on a level with the most respectable yeomery of the land. Though subject to Pharaoh as their king, they retained the patriarchal form of government as far as regards the dominion of the elder brother, and were regulated by the divine law of love in all their relations. But the tyrant Pharaoh who knew not Joseph, set aside the law of God, and ruled over them by violence or *with rigor*.

1. He deposed the elder brethren, and placed over both elder and younger, Egyptian task-masters.

2. He made them perform labor to which they had not been accustomed, to which they had not consented, and for which they were under no obligations. "They built for Pharaoh, treasure cities, Pithom and Raamsis," they were compelled to labor "in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field."

3. Their labors were regulated by the lusts of the tyrant and his desires. The whole system itself and the management of it, was rigor or violence.

The phrase *ruling with rigor* is equivalent to *exercising dominion or lordship*, which our Lord uses (Mat. xx, 25) to express the subjection under which rulers and "great men" among the Gentiles hold their fellow-men. The original (katakuriueuo*) is used (Acts ix, 14) to signify overcoming a man by force or violence. The apostle admits, when addressing the servants of slavemasters (despotes, the name given to such masters in pagan lands as were slaveholders), that although some of their masters were constitutionally *froward*, others were *good and gentle*—"used their slaves well." The thing which our Lord objects to, among the rulers and the great men of the Gentiles, and which he *tells* his disciples must not be among them, is not the comparative severity with which they managed their usurped authority, but compelling their fellow-men to submit to a system of *rigor or lordship*, instead of that good law which God has given, which requires us to love our neighbors as ourselves. He admits that these lordly tyrants were

* This is the word used in the Septuagint, to translate *rule with rigor*.

counted benefactors, in countries where the atonement was unknown; it made them respectable. "But it shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant, even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, etc."

An important reason in addition to the sinfulness of *rigor*, is assigned for not compelling elders to serve as servants—"They are my servants which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt." This is explained by recollecting what we have already noticed, viz:—*The first born saved by the blood of the Paschal Lamb, were peculiarly holy to the Lord.* They were typical persons. They, as elders and the sons of Aaron, to whom were assigned the priesthood and the men of Judah to whom was given the dominion, and the Levites to whom was transferred the service of the sanctuary, in subordination to the priests, were all landholders, all types of Jesus our prophet, priest and king. Their poverty when they waxed poor, corresponded with the humiliation of him who *though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became*

poor. He was not deposed when he left his heavenly inheritance to tabernacle among us. Though he took upon him the form of a servant, and came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, yet through all his humiliation, he was to his younger brethren all that was typified by those invested with the birth-right privileges among the patriarchs, and throughout the Jewish dispensation. There was no pause in the worship of him by angels, or holy men, or in the work of saving those who believed on Him. The question whether he should be deposed, or return again to his inheritance in heaven, and to his father's right hand, depended exclusively on the merits of his atonement. In order therefore that those who were types of Him, might not be false types, no advantage must be taken of their poverty; they must not in any way be degraded; their restoration to their inheritance, and deliverance from all the inconveniences, which their poverty had induced, must be effected by the atonement.

NOTE.—We shall not make a separated article of the regulation toward the close of this chapter, 47—55. After securing to strangers

the privilege of being servants, it is said, "If a sojourner or stranger wax rich," etc. The amount of it is—if an Israelite wax poor and sell himself to this rich stranger, he shall have the privilege of redemption at any time; if not redeemed, the jubilee atonement shall release him; and the statute closes with another prohibition of rigor. The reason of all this is evident. No sojourner or stranger possessed any of the birth-right privileges. He might be the type of a Gentile servant of Jesus Christ; but he was not a type of Jesus Christ, and therefore could not be a *master*. Any money therefore which he might pay to a poor brother for future services, must be received with the understanding that as soon as it could be paid back they were clear of each other, and if the money were not refunded, the atonement should release him. The release in such cases by redemption or atonement was typical. But we shall not inquire into its meaning.

We can not close on this part of our subject without noticing a sweeping and frightful inference which we have frequently heard drawn from the prohibition of *rigor* in regard to landholders who became poor, and those who had

sold themselves to rich strangers. We noticed it not so much for the purpose of refutation, as to show how easily the understanding of wise men can be perverted when once they enlist in the work of apologizing for sin. The inference which they draw from this special prohibition of rigor in specified cases is, that there was no sin in treating strangers and younger brothers in Israel with rigor. Thus, they assume the monstrous principle, that a prohibition in certain specified circumstances amounts to a license in other circumstances. We have only to apply this principle to be shocked by it. The wife of Manoah was forbidden to *eat any unclean thing*, for a certain season. Judg. xiii, 14. Do we infer from this that at other times she might eat unclean things and thus become a pagan? Again: a Jew was allowed to marry a beautiful captive, but if he had no delight in her, he was to let her go whither she would, "Thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her." Deut. xxi, 10-14. Does this prove that other Jewish husbands might make merchandise of their wives, and sell them for money? Plain common sense would say, that such prohibitions

only prove that in some circumstances there are peculiar temptations to sin ; and that some sins are peculiarly heinous.

IX. *The atonement secured to those who were restored to their possession, and to pious strangers, the mutual privilege of engaging to live together as masters and servants, until the next jubilee. When those leprous spots, bondmen and bond-maids, which we have already accounted for, are wiped from our translation, the statute runs thus: Both thy servants and thy maidens, which thou shalt have shall be of the heathen that are round about you, of them shall ye buy servants and maidens. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of those families that are with you, which they begot in your land, and they shall be your possession ; and ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you to inherit them for a possession ; they shall be your servants forever, but over your brethren, the children of Israel, ye shall not rule over another with rigor ? **

The time was when professed Christians could honestly quote this passage as proof, that when the children of Israel were standing before

* Levit. xxv, 44-46.

Mount Sinai, they received a license to erect shambles in the holy land for the sale of the bodies and souls of Pagans, when they might conquer in battle, and those sojourners among them who might wax poor and fall into decay. But that time, we trust, has gone by forever. It is still quoted by ministers in ecclesiastical judicatories for the purpose of confounding the abolitionists. But all attentive observers have noticed that in every instance care is taken to connect with the quotation, a solemn disavowal of the principle of subjecting captives and poor people to involuntary servitude. Thus they unintentionally declare that they have no fellowship with what they conceive to be the morality of the Bible, and that they merely wish to make its author do what they would consider too dirty a business for a clergyman. Under the light of the present day it would look like trifling with the understanding of our readers, gravely to prove that the sale of services here contemplated was voluntary. We shall notice however some facts as to the attempts that have been made to enlist this statute in the slaveholder's service, etc., some of the absurdities to which such a use of it necessarily leads.

1. Pious and intelligent expositors, prior to the commencement of the slave-trade, never undertook to make this statute justify involuntary sales of personal services, or making slaves of human beings.

2. Since that event, it has been used to justify both the African and American slaveholders. This is done by our most respectable commentators, and writers on Biblical antiquities. Even John Brown of Haddingsten, asserts in his Dictionary of the Bible, that the Hebrews enslaved their captives and sold or disposed of them as they thought fit; and his only proof is the permission (Lev. xxv, 44) to buy servants of the heathen. If *buying servants be taking captives in war*, there are ministers who have been on a hundred campaigns and victorious in as many pitched battles as Julius Cæsar, who never had weapons of war in their hands, and never had courage to face any enemy. Some expositors are so determined to find *slavery by captivity* among the Bible institutions, that they bring it forward where it contradicts the very letter of the text they are expounding. They insist that Abraham's servants were his prisoners in war expeditions,

Yet Moses says he bought them with money, i. e., they were servants who had sold their services for what they considered a compensation. The best apology for these good men is, they took their views on this subject second handed from the writings of the Jesuits in defense of the slave-making wars in Africa, and they really did not know what they were about.

Why this anxiety to find a text in favor of *slavery by captivity*? On that depended the whole question respecting slave-making, and slave-trading, and slave-holding. Is it right to send our ships full of armed men to the coast of Africa, to fire their villages at midnight and shoot down their warriors in the light of the blaze, and seize the woman and little ones and ship them to the American plantations? Until this question was settled, it was necessary to quote texts to prove that it was lawful to meet the ships on their return and buy their cargoes with money. And even that profound maxim of the Jesuits—*the birth follows the belly*—would have no bearing on the lawfulness of enslaving the children, until it was decided that those who seized their mothers had a divine warrant for converting them into property.

Hence *slavery by captivity* is, with many expositors, like *Carthaga delenda*, with the man who had sworn that Carthage should perish.

3. The law did not permit the Israelites to make captives of the warriors whom they conquered in battle—much less, to make them slaves. Of the seven nations they were to save alive nothing that breathed. Deut. xx, 16. Of the other nations if their terms of peace were not accepted, they were to smite all the men with the edge of the sword, and take home the women and little ones. Deut. xx. The provisions which the law made for their support and comfort, we have already noticed. See Deut. xiv, 28, 29; Lev. xix, 19—21.

When piety was at the lowest ebb in Israel, the idea of enslaving captives was shocking. Some soldiers of the apostate ten tribes attempted it. But Oded, a man of God met them, and after showing them God's hatred of their sin, they were stricken with horror. And "they took the captives, and with the spoil clothed all that were naked among them, and gave them to eat and drink, and anointed them, and carried all that were feeble of them upon asses, and brought them to Jericho, the city of

palm trees, to their brethren," 2 Chron. xxviii, 15. Had there been an Oded among our ministers, when the first slave ships arrived on our coasts, we had not this day been cursed with slavery. Had the ten tribes been rioting for generations on the labors of strangers turned aside from their rights, the man of God would have fared as abolitionists do in the South.

4. The idea, that it is lawful to make slaves of captives, was borrowed by Christians from pagans. Among the heathen divinities one of the favorites was Mars, the god of war. With him the highest attainment in virtue was, to be a fierce and successful fighter; and to be whipped and conquered in combat was one of the most unpardonable crimes. The word *virtue* among pagans literally meant military courage. And to make his worshipers fight like bulldogs, it was the law, that the conquered and his wife and children should be slaves of the conquerers. Theologians transferred to the God of Israel the most detestable attribute of a pagan god, for the purpose of securing to slavers and their employers a cordial reception at the Lord's table.

5. Those who justify this principle by quot-

ing the scriptures, do not themselves believe it. They never act upon it, and then never profess to believe it, except when they are pinched in defense of African slavery. The British and American soldiers, in their wars with each other never thought of enslaving their prisoners. Had any of the nations, in their wars with each other, during the last century reduced this principle to practice, it would have roused the indignation of the whole civilized world.

6. As soon as the slavers brought us enough slaves from Africa, we clearly discovered that subjecting even the Africans taken in war to involuntary servitude, is inconsistent with the word of God, and ought to be punished with death. Our rulers have pronounced it piracy. The same men whom our planters used to meet on the beach with money to pay them for their trouble, and texts to convince them that they were engaged in a lawful calling, they now seize as pirates, and after a due course of law they hang them by the neck till they are dead. Could the pious Mr. Poole or Mr. Brown attend the execution of some of our pirates, charged with no crime but that of fairly carrying out this principle of *slavery by captivity*,

they would exclaim as Saul did—*I have played the fool and erred exceedingly.*

7. This statute is now quoted to justify those who bought their slaves from the pirates. Those who are loudest in condemning pirates and slave-making warriors, have no difficulty in advocating the practice of buying slaves. And they generally get along by refusing to have any thing to do with the question—how those who sold the bought persons acquired their right. They remind us of some infidel world-makers who were troublesome toward the close of the last century. To get rid of the necessity of a Creator, and the account which Moses has given of the creation, they contended that our world was formed of an infinite number of atoms which from eternity had been floating at random until they were brought together by a fortuitous concurrence. The question, who made those *eternal atoms*, they would have nothing to do with—it was either a delicate question, or too contemptible for a philosopher.

8. To justify themselves in holding the slaves bought from pirates, they adopt the principle, that the receiver of stolen goods,

knowing them to be such, is not partaker with the thief. Yet they do not believe it, and they never pretend to believe it excepting when they are urged to repent of the sin of slaveholding. Such a principle fairly written out would disgrace the civil code of the most contemptible nation on earth. The contrary is acknowledged as an axiom in all courts, civil and ecclesiastical. Excepting when the liberty of an African is pending, there is not, nor never was a church court which would not inflict the highest censure on any member who would refuse to repent of so scandalous a crime as buying one dollar's worth of property knowing it to be stolen. You would search in vain among the offscourings of the human race for two men shameless enough to avow it as a part of their creed, that it is right to buy and hold property known to be stolen. The man who *sees a thief* and *merely consents with him* the Lord will not hold guiltless. Ps. 1, 18.

9. That the man who receives stolen goods, knowing them to be such, is as really guilty as the thief, never was questioned while the slave-trade was in good repute. So long as the slaver was counted a good Christian, those who

bought his wares felt that they could admit the maxim in question without condemning themselves. But when the principles of the Gospel were brought to bear on the slave-trade, the slaveholders considered it an attack on the firm; and they in turn began to spoil the maxim which condemns the receivers of stolen goods. Cases of the following kind would *put them to the pinch*. A poor wretch is caught in the very act of bringing slaves from Africa, to sell them to our planters. He has been fairly tried and condemned as a pirate. His execution takes place on Saturday. The minister of the village attends him to the gallows. Up to the last moment he urges him to repent. As God's ambassador, and with many tears, he assures him that there is no pardon for the sin for which he dies, but through repentance and faith in the blood of the atonement. But on the Sabbath morning he has to preach to a congregation of slaveholders. They bought their slaves of the man whose execution they lately witnessed or from his partners in iniquity. Perhaps the minister himself was among the foremost in this *bad business*. Now how shall such a minister preach to such a

people? He must either tell them that without repentance both they and their pastor will go down to hell; or he must adopt the principle that the receiver of stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen, is innocent, while the thief ought to be punished. He adopts the latter course as the *more prudent* of the two, and for Scripture proof quotes the permission in this statute to buy servants of the heathen, assuring them that slave-making and slaveholding were among the precious privileges secured to the congregation and pious strangers, by the jubilee atonement. The question would naturally recur—"why then hang the slavemaker as we did on Saturday?" But it is easy for a minister to throw dust in the eyes of his people, and they are very willing to have it done, when it keeps them from seeing the necessity of repenting of sins which they do not wish to part with.

10. If buying servants of the heathen means stripping them of their freedom and holding them as slaves, the same phrase must be understood in the same way, throughout the chapter. It would seem then that not only had Israelites a divine license for converting

Gentiles into property, but the Gentiles had the same license in regard to Israelites (see verse 47),* and the younger brethren the same as it regarded their elder brother when he waxed poor—verse 39.* Hence we have a statute which nullifies all the allegations imposed by the Sinai covenant on Jews and Gentiles to love one another when poor and fallen into decay. The command to *relieve him, yea though he be a stranger, or a sojourner, that he may live with thee* was scarcely uttered by the Almighty, when it was displaced by a sweeping permission to treat each other as pirates. The direct tendency of this statute thus interpreted would be to make the holy land one of those dens of violence and cruelty, into which no poor man, unless he was able to whip every man he met with, would even dare to set his foot. And the fair application of it would be this: the Scriptures allow us to enslave the African stranger when he waxes poor, and it allows the free African to enslave us when we wax poor, and he waxes rich. This would produce rare work in some neighborhoods.

11. Slaveholders do not believe that this, or

* Levit. xxv.

any other statute in the Bible justifies slaveholding. If they did, they would immediately go to work in supplying 'all the slaves in the United States with Bibles, and entreating them to read and understand them; that they might see that it is the will of God they should be slaves, and that discontentment with their condition is rebellion against Heaven. But they know better. "Give slaves the Bible, and they will be free" is the universal apology for the ignorance in which they are held. To prevent them from seeing what God has written respecting the sin of oppression, slaveholding churches are turning Papists, and contending that "oral instruction is sufficient," and in the meantime law-makers are enacting that dungeons, and whipping posts, and penitentiaries, and even the gallows shall be employed to punish those who dare to teach them to read the word of God.

12. The character of the persons whom they might buy for servants and hand-maids shows that it was voluntary servitude—the persons sold themselves.

First, they were pious. Every servant bought with money was to be circumcised and admitted to the passover. Gen. xvii, 13; Ex. xii, 44.

The pious stranger was entitled to such relief as prevented poverty from compelling him to sell himself; verse 35. If the servitude here legalized was that horrible thing slavery, we can not see why it was to be inflicted on none but those who were believers in the Messiah. Did the Sinai covenant class faith in the Redeemer with the sins to be punished by the judges? Perhaps we shall be told that none but those who had been born again were worthy of the blessings of slavery, and the privilege of being held and disposed of as a mere thing was reserved for pious proselytes as an inducement to strangers to come and settle in the holy land. We shall leave it to the advocates of slavery to say, whether the bait was very alluring. If it was, it would greatly facilitate the business of slave-catching. The Israelites could plant themselves along the paths which led the pious Gentile to the place where the God of Abraham was worshiped and spring upon him from behind the bush and drive him off to market. But we think, that under such an arrangement the visits of Gentiles to the holy city would be "few and far between." In our Southern States, there is a law that a free

colored person remaining there, a certain number of days, shall be taken up and sold. We do not hear of them rushing from other States to that region, to enjoy the blessings of slavery.

Second, they were to be of the heathen round about. The Canaanites, for a reason to be noticed hereafter, were excluded. They might be of three classes, viz: those just from the heathen—or those, that had been sojourning among them (living as tenants), or their children born in the land. It seems to have been optional with the pious stranger who arrived, whether to become the servants of some of the landholders and thus obtain a fixed residence for fifty years, or settle down as a tenant at will—as a sojourner.

It is worth while, to notice the difficulties into which the slaveholder plunges, the moment he undertakes to carry out his theory that this was involuntary servitude and that the servants were obtained by captivity in war, and by purchase from some one invested with authority to sell them as property.

We can easily perceive, how an Israelite would buy as a voluntary servant, a tenant or

a pious stranger who was sojourning with him. He could go to his house and offer him a fair compensation for his service until the next jubilee. But how could he buy him as a slave? Slaveselling requires three persons—the buyer, the seller, and the person sold. And where could the third person be found authorized to sell the body and soul of the sojourner as his property, and pocket the money?

The theory that this sojourning stranger was to be taken captive in war is attended with equal difficulty. If his landlord was an able bodied man, he could take him captive, but to make him *a slave by captivity in war*, would require some of “the pomp, pride, and circumstances of glorious warfare.”

The fact, that all bought servants were to be admitted to the distinguishing ordinances of the church, shows at once the absurdity of supposing that those just from the heathen, were captives, sold by slave-makers. The surrounding nations were idolatrous and extremely filthy as to their morals. Exceptions in this respect were extremely rare. But the Jesuits, with a dexterity resembling that of the animal that always lights on its feet, get over this dif-

ficulty very easily. Their maxim, in substance, is that no matter what be his character or principles, a Pagan, who is whipped in a military fight, is, *ipso facto*, fit for the enjoyment of the privileges of the church. We are not slandering that brotherhood. In their Bamburgh synopsis, and other writings, they gravely and at considerable length, endeavor to prove that it was right in Abraham to make slaves of his captives, in as much as he *compelled* them to submit to circumcision, and thus propagated the true religion. It is thus the Jesuits justify their own operations after the Pope had licensed the African slave-trade. From the history of South America, one would be tempted to suppose that they actually baptized their converts at the point of the bayonet. It is a historical fact that "one ecclesiastic baptised five thousand in one day—and stopped only when he became so exhausted as to be unable to lift up his hands." The baptism of Atahuelpha was in perfect keeping with such notions of conversion. After paying the enormous amount of gold required for his ransom, they determined to put him to death. But to make a Christian business of it, they resolved to

convert him. And how did they accomplish it? Why, they gave him his choice, either to be baptised and die the easy death of strangling, or remain an infidel, and be roasted to death by a slow fire!

By assuming that the servants, whom the statue of the jubilee authorised the Israelites to buy from the heathen, were captives in war, and by putting this by the side of the statute that servants were to be admitted to the privileges of the church, the Jesuits invented one of the most powerful arguments to induce Christians to enlist in the wars of Africa. All Christendom were given to understand, that every soldier who conquered an African, would thereby bring a poor perishing idolator into the Holy Catholic Church, and at the same time become the lawful owner of a slave. This was a great improvement on the bounties hitherto offered for the purpose of enlisting soldiers. Mahomet promised his soldiers a place in paradise, with plenty of concubines. The greatest offer the Pope could think of, to raise armies to conquer the holy land, was *plenary indulgence*. But the bounty which his successors offered to those who would enlist for the slave-

making wars in Africa, was enough to make soldiers of his followers—every man who whipped an African in military combat thereby converted a soul, and furnished himself with an able bodied slave ! And when the world demanded Scripture proof, the Jesuits pointed to the permission to buy servants of the heathen, and informed them that the proper meaning of it is ; permission to make slaves of captives ; and to prove that such process was nearly the same thing as conversion, they pointed to the text which required bought servants to be circumcised and admitted to the passover. A slave could not be bought in Israel of a pagan master. If he raised the cry for help, they were obliged to deliver him. Deut. xxii, 15.

But, as we have said already, the day when Christians could honestly quote the jubilee in defense of either the African or American slave-trade has gone by forever. We have noticed some of the absurdities into which some of our wisest men have fallen, as a warning to beware of prostituting the holy word of God, to so vile a purpose as defending sin.

The obvious interpretation of the statute is,

that as soon as the atonement was finished, the priest was to blow the trumpet as a signal for the landholders to throw open their gates for pious strangers; and for those who had lately come from any surrounding nations, and those who had been for some time sojourning in the land, and those who had been born there, to come and obtain permanent habitations as servants for fifty years. Still it was optional with them whether they settled down as tenants by the year, or servants till the next jubilee. We shall notice but two reasons for this arrangement.

1st. Pious strangers could not for some time enter into the congregation, and they had no possessions, the land having been disposed by lot, and secured to Hebrew families by the jubilee. This involved some inconveniences which the arrangement, now under consideration, was calculated in some measure to remedy. The believing stranger was to be circumcised and admitted to the passover, he could offer sacrifices, he was under the same law, and enjoyed the same privileges with the descendants of Abraham in every respect excepting this, he had no inheritance, and could not for some time

enter into the congregation. Ex. xii, 49. Numb. xv, 14-16. Deut. xxiii, 1-8. Some, for reasons specified, were excluded for a longer, others for a shorter time. The Moabites and Ammonites attempted to hinder God's people from entering into the typical Canaan; and as a standing monument of God's hatred of such a sin, they were prohibited from entering into the congregation, even *to the tenth generation forever*. Thus all future generations were admonished, that God will hold no people guiltless who hinder any class of sinners in their way to the heavenly Canaan. Let those lawmakers in the South who, by bloody enactments, prevent Africans from reading or hearing the gospel take warning. And let those ministers, who by marriage have become the owners of slaves, and are standing with their clubs between them and the fountain of life, remember that the God of Israel lives. The shortest time in which any converted idolators could enter into the congregation, was in the third generation. The Edomites, as they were the brethren of the children of Israel; and the Egyptians, in consideration of the kindness long shown to Jacob and his children when strangers in their

land, were to enter in the third generation. The design in requiring converted idolators to remain some time out of the congregation, was to express strongly the Lord's hatred of the sin of worshipping another God. In the Ten Commandments he makes that sin the butt of his displeasure. He declares he will be jealous in regard to that spiritual adultery, and "visit the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." If an idolator repented as David did of his sin in the case of Uriah, he should be pardoned and saved. But as in the case of David, God would show to all around him, his hatred of the sin which he had pardoned. Should any nation now repent of idolatry, and throw away their idols, and embrace the Savior, God will forgive that people and take them into favour with himself. But for three or four generations to come, the traveler when he compares them with nations that have been worshipping the true God for centuries, will see the evidence that they have been tampering with idols, and that God hates idolatry. This, to which the allusion seems to be, in part, in the fourth commandment, was not peculiar to the Mosaic

dispensation. It existed in the days of Abraham. His converts were not on a level with his children as regards heirship. Isaac was his heir. His converts were sojourners with him, if they entered into engagements with him as his farmers or keepers of his cattle, they were his *servants bought with money*.

But what is meant by not entering into the congregation? It implied three things: 1st. When the congregation and strangers worshipped at the house of God, they were separated by what is called *the middle wall of partition*. Eph. ii, 14. This separation wall is now removed by the death of Christ; it is peculiar to the New Testament church that in God's house there is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond or free. 2d.—Strangers could not marry Hebrew women. A Hebrewman might marry a proselyted captive. Deut. xx, 10–14. But a Hebrew woman could marry such strangers only as had entered into the congregation. Hence, in the genealogy of David's family, we are told that Abigail his sister had a son (Amasa) by Jether the Ishmaelite, 1 Chron. ii, 17. But to show that this is no stain on her memory or family, we are informed that he was an Israelite.

2 Sam. xvii, 25. It seems that when they entered into the congregation, they were not strangers, but Israelites. 3rd. Of course the strangers, while separated from the congregation, could not become land owners as younger brethren among the Hebrews could, by marrying females who were heiresses in consequence of the latter having no brother. The Lord often notices with great tenderness, inconveniences of the pious strangers in these respects. In addition to the many arrangements to secure kind treatment from their brethren, he promises that he will more than make up for their other wants by the enjoyment of himself. In connection with the address to eunuchs he says: "Neither let the son of the stranger that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak saying, the Lord hath utterly separated me from his people: the sons of the strangers that joined themselves unto the Lord to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer; their burnt offerings, and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar, for

mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people."—Isaiah lvi, 1-8.

To promote the comfort of this people who had left their kindred and country, and were now strangers in a land where they could have no possessions, the sound of the trumpet was the signal that the atonement had secured to them the privilege of living as servants until the next jubilee wherever it *liked them best*. They might live as tenants by the year or at will, if they pleased. But for the same reason that in Britain and other countries, long leases are considered favorable to the interest of both landlord and tenant, it would also promote the comfort of those strangers and their employers to enter into engagements for fifty years, or until the next jubilee trumpet should proclaim *liberty to all the inhabitants of the land*. And to promote still further the comfort of all who had forsaken their kindred and country, for the sake of enjoying the means of salvation in the Holy Land, all others were excluded from this privilege. The Canaanites could enjoy it (Gen: ix, 25), and poor Hebrews could engage only for six years. But there was another design in this institution of servants from the heathen around.

2. *It typified the privilege the Gentile world should enjoy, under the new dispensation—the privilege of becoming the servants of Jesus Christ.* It was the presage of that glorious era, when the great trumpet should be blown, proclaiming that the true atonement is finished, and inviting sinners in the uttermost parts of the earth, to come in and be the servants of Jesus Christ. Its typical meaning is explained by the allusion to it in the second psalm, where the very words of the statute are used:

“I will declare the decree, the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me and I will give thee the heathen for thine *inheritance* and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy *possession*.” Ps. ii, 7–8.

This text, and that in Lev. xxv, 44–46, now under consideration, mutually explain and illustrate each other. The one exhibits the type, the other the anti-type. If we can settle the meaning of the one, there can be no difficulty in understanding the other.

1. *This day*, according to the exposition of the psalm, by an inspired writer (Acts xiii, 33), means the morning of the Savior’s resurrec-

tion, when the merits of the atonement were tried and proved in his rising gloriously from the dead. It was typified by that hour on the morning of the jubilee, when the safe return of the High Priest from within the vail, proved that God had accepted the blood of the sin-offering, as a typical atonement for the sins of the people.

2. Our glorious High Priest, proclaiming by the Gospel trumpet his own exaltation, and blessings for the Gentiles as the fruits of his atonement, was symbolized by the High Priest in Israel, causing the trumpet to sound, throughout all the land, the typical privilege secured to all interested with birth-right privileges, etc., and to pious Gentiles by the typical atonement.

3. One subject of the decree is the exaltation of our elder brother to the enjoyment of his inheritance, at his father's right hand. "Thou art my son," etc. "I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion," etc. The decree is not that Jesus shall be a divine being. His divinity no more depends on a decree than the divinity of the father. It is that exaltation of our divine, incarnate elder brother, to all that authority and power which was

typified by the exaltation of the elder brother, first born, the begotten, etc., by virtue of the atonement on the morning of the jubilee.

4. Another subject of the decree, was that the heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth were given by the father to his son. And the psalm closes with exhortation to the nations to serve the Lord with fear, to kiss the son lest they perish from the way. This gift to the exalted Savior, was typified by the privilege secured to the first born in Israel, of buying Gentile servants from the heathen round about, etc.

5. Both the typical and anti-typical elder brother, as appears from this psalm in connection with Leviticus, were to take those servants from the Gentiles as an *inheritance and possession*.

Let us here settle the meaning of the term *inheritance and possession*. The apologists for slavery, remind us that a *possession* in common conversation means *property*, and that *inheritance* means something obtained by the death of a father, or some other relative or friend.

And from this sage piece of criticism, or the

text, "ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit for a possession," he draws the comfortable inference that it is Scriptural to hold bodies and souls as property, and that when the father dies and can hold him no longer, the son is to seize him as his property, and then the grandson, etc., until the slave dies. And the criticism has, no doubt, made the hand of many an old slaveholder steady, when consigning to his heirs a large list of slaves with his cattle, at the moment when he knew, that in a few hours he would be called into the immediate presence of God his judge. But we have only to apply this criticism and look at it, to perceive its absurdity. Waiving the question whether a man can take as *inheritance* that which he has bought with money, let us apply it to the text in hand. Did Jesus Christ receive the heathen as a legacy by the death of his father or some friend? The application of this criticism, to any other text in the Bible, is equally nonsensical, and in most cases, it is equally blasphemous.

It is strange that the reflecting can be reconciled to such egregious and mischievous folly,

as interpreting Scripture terms by their use in common conversation. Who does not know that the meaning of words in conversation is various and perpetually varying. You can not travel three days in any direction, without hearing the same word used in different senses, and every generation varies in some degree from the preceding. Who is ignorant that the rule laid down in the Scriptures, and acknowledged in the creeds of all Protestant churches, is, *the meaning of Scripture terms is to be ascertained by the use of them in the Scriptures themselves?*

What then do inspired writers mean by an *inheritance* or a *possession*? They are often used as interchangeable terms. The portions of the several families in the land of Canaan were assigned to them by the Lord himself, through the use of the lot; they were taken possession of by resort to the blood of sacrifices; and they were secured to their several owners by the blood of the jubilee atonement. From that time forward and throughout the Scriptures, that which is the gift of God, and obtained through the blood of the atonement, and thereby secured to us, is called an *inherit-*

ance or possession. Take as examples the following texts: Believers are called God's inheritance—Ps. xxviii, 9, and xciv, 14. God is said to be the inheritance and possession of the Levites; Ezek. xliv, 28. Thus, also, in the psalm before us, the heathen are called the inheritance and possession of the Son of God, because they are given to him by his father, and his privilege to have them as his servants, was obtained and secured by the blood which he shed to make atonement for them. So, also, in the ordinance of the jubilee, the privilege of buying Gentile servants was obtained and secured by the typical atonement. The atonement in both cases was the foundation of the relations of master and servant.

Let us now analyze the ordinance of the jubilee respecting Gentile servants, in the light of the second psalm, and other parallel texts. The following items are obvious:

1. The masters were those who were invested with birth-right privileges, viz: the elder brethren, the priests, the Levites, and those to whom was given the dominion forfeited by Reuben, which was eventually lodged in the family of David of the tribe of Judah.

Their masters were the types of our glorious Master in whom are united the offices of prophet, priest, and kinsman redeemer, kinsman revenger, and avenger of blood.

The other masters were all themselves servants in some sense of the term. That is, they were younger brethren, and therefore servants in the sense in which all who are subjects to their elder brother, as their magistrate or ruler, are called servants; Gen. xxvii, 29-37. Or, in addition to this subjection they had come under voluntary obligations to labor wholly or principally for a time, in the service of another, and were therefore servants in another sense—such as Ziba the servant of Mephiboseth, who had twenty servants. The servants of such masters were those who are called *servants of servants*. Neither they nor their servants were types. And therefore that servitude was not regulated by the law, excepting so far as was necessary to prevent injustice or oppression, or any unfair treatment; Lev. xix, 2-13. From this view of the matter, we may safely infer the nature of the service in which the pious servant from the heathen was employed. The masters were all owners of land.

The elders were the planters of the soil. The priests and Levites although they did not inherit as the other tribes, yet had cities to live in, and suburbs for pasture for their cattle. So had the rulers of the family of Judah. On the land of those typical masters the nation was dependent for bread, and wine, and oil, and cattle. They would all need servants in their fields. And it is remarkable that whenever the prophets allude to the employment of Gentile servants they always assign the honorable employment of tilling the ground, laboring in the vineyard, keeping cattle. It is also worthy of notice that so common was it for proselyted strangers to be thus employed, that in prophetic language those revivals in the churches which issued in gathering in from the heathen, are described as times of increasing their servants from the Gentiles—their husbandman, and vinedressers, and shepherds. “And they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations. And strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and the sons of the alien shall be your plowmen, and your vinedressers.”

Isaiah lxi, 4, 5. The same prophet predicts that through the divine blessing on the exemplary deportment of pious captives at Babylon, many of those who had taken them captive should be converted; and when the Lord should bring his people back, these pious Gentiles should cleave to them and become their servants in the holy land. "For the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel and set them in their own land; and the strangers shall be joined with them and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob. And the people shall take them and bring them to their place, and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the Lord for servants and handmaids;" Isaiah xiv, 1, 2. These servants or tenants, as we would call them, were on a level with the most respectable of the land. When courtiers and princes and the respectable yeomanry of the land were thronging to welcome David on his return to Jerusalem after the defeat of the rebels in the wood of Ephraim, there were none whom the king took by the hand more cordially than Ziba the servant of Mephibosheth. There was no employment in the holy land more honorable

than that which the law assigned to these servants. Kings were not ashamed of it. Uriah "had much cattle both in the low countries and in the plains, husbandmen also, and vine-dressers in the mountains, and in Carmel; for he loved husbandry." In the organization of David's court, we find those who were over his fields, and vineyards, and flocks, on the same list with his most honorable courtiers and ministers of state; and among them we find strangers, an Ishmaelite and Hagarite; 1 Chron. xxvii, 25-34.

3. The services of these typical servants were liberally paid for. The masters were commanded to *buy them*, i. e., to pay them such a sum of money, or such amount of produce as would secure a legal claim in the sight of the just God, for their services until the jubilee. We shall notice a proof of this as commanding as any detail of Scripture texts. In the ninth chapter, of the first epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle rests the claim of all ministers of the New Testament, to a comfortable support of themselves and their families, on the fact that the law of Moses required, that all who in any way served or labored, should have a liberal

recompense. He notices particularly, the priests who served at the altar, the Levites who ministered about holy things, those who labored in vineyards, those who kept flocks, all who tilled the grounds, the plowers, and the sowers, the reapers, and threshers. He also notices the statute, "thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." In addition to the food which an ox was ordinarily allowed, it should have the privilege of eating as much of the corn as it would, while threshing. As a home thrust at those who can suppose that the law could make such provisions for dumb brutes, and at the same time doom immortal beings to a life of unrequited toil, he asks, "Doth God care for oxen? Or saith he it all for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, it was written; that he that ploweth should plow in hope, and he that thresheth in hope, should be partaker of his hope." In other words, that statute was intended to hold up clearly this principle, that in God's kingdom all laborers from the plower and thresher up to the priest and the gospel minister shall be cheered with the hope of receiving just wages. Perhaps some of our readers are still incredulous, and

insist that those servants who cultivated the fields and vineyards, and kept the cattle were required by the law to labor as slaves, without just wages. This theory will lead to many inconveniences. It would follow : 1. That the law of Moses, in regard to servitude, was at war with the eternal principles of rectitude. 2. The apostle Paul when guided by the spirit of inspiration, was a very bad reasoner. 3. He was one of those griping preachers, who can swindle the churches out of more support than they are entitled to, and even pervert and prostitute the law of Moses to the gratification of their own covetousness. 4. All ministers of the New Testament must give up their stipend ; for the argument of the apostle in their favor is altogether inconclusive.*

* We could name one minister in the South who will cheerfully meet the consequence as regards the stipend rather than give up that *domestic institution*. Some years ago he went to the South for the sake of his health, and that he might spend and be spent in that destitute region. In a few months, mistaking some hundreds of field slaves for so many qualifications for a bishop's wife, he married their mistress, and thus had "that evil, to which we are all generally opposed in principle, unfortunately entailed upon him." As an evidence of the tendency of slave-

4. Proselytes from nations round about and their children were to enjoy exclusively the privilege of selling their servants until the jubilee. The Canaanites were excluded. Canaan had in some way been guilty with his father Ham of that wicked treatment of Noah. He commenced his career where every candidate for infamy and ruin commences. And as a perpetual warning to the new world that God will not permit disobedience to parents to go unpunished, he and his posterity were cut off from the privileges of that kind of servitude of which we are speaking. If their circumstances at any time made it necessary, or desirable that they should become servants, they should not

holding to promote heavenly mindedness in ministers, we were soon informed, in various ways, that he would take no stipend. He was spending all his time, gratuitously as pastor among his own slaves. And that his mind might not be distracted with any worldly cares, he had committed the business of whipping his congregation, and keeping them to the cotton hills, entirely to a faithful overseer. Should the health of this dear brother again fail through want of exercise, we would recommend an occasional exchange of employment with the overseer. Neither of the employments would be degraded by the exchange.

serve the landholders in that honorable employment of the field with habitations which they could claim as theirs for fifty years; they should labor by the day or year or some short period, in the service of those who were themselves in some sense servants. 'They should be *servants of servants*.* Gen. ix, 25. When the

* The apologists for slavery are sure, that *servants of servants* means slaves. Yet in fact it means no such thing. Ziba was a servant—we can hardly think he was a slave when we see him among the princes and lords and ladies taking the king by the hand to congratulate him on his return to his throne. He had twenty servants. They were all the servants of servants, but they were not slaves. But those who can see a little ahead are not fond of urging that our slaves are *servants of servants*—for this would make both slaves and masters servants in some sense. And how could a republican bear it?

The usual argument for slavery is any text which contains the word *servant* or *master*; and to doubt that these terms mean *slave* and *slaveholder*, is decisive proof that you are a fanatic, and, perhaps, ought to be lynched. According to them, the Bible has such a partiality for that *domestic institution*, that it never notices any kind of servants or masters, but slaves and slaveholders. Now, we ask, which is the fanatic, he who insists that the word of God approved the masters of voluntary servants and excluded slaveholders from the churches, or he, who says that it approved the slavemaster and excluded all who

law was given at Sinai, the unhappy Canaanites had filled up their cup of iniquity and were going on in sin. They were given up as a people to dispossession or extirpation if they resisted in battle. Like all sinners they had the privilege of repenting and being saved. Many of them, like Uriah the Hittite, and others mentioned, did repent. The law in such cases made every provision necessary for their comfort. They might make engagements with Israelites to labor as hirelings or *servants of servants*. Hence Joshua made the Gibeonites hewers of wood and drawers of water. But they could not be *servants until the jubilee*. This privilege was reserved for the proselytes from the nations around. "Both thy bondmen

would not make slaves of their fellow-men? Perhaps some one will step forward and say, "both parties are wrong, the word of God recognises and approves both." But the slaveholder would never consent to this—it would lay him under the necessity of showing in what text *master* means slaveholder, and in what text it means the master of a voluntary servant. This no slaveholder ever has attempted and no one ever will. The truth is, the terms *master* and *servant* are to be explained by reference to the kingdom to which they belong. Their meaning is different in the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the devil.

and bondmaids (servants and maidens), which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen round about you—of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids—they shall be your bondmen forever," i. e., throughout the Mosaic dispensation. The latter clause is rendered in the margin, *ye shall serve yourselves of them forever*. In other words, the typical masters shall in no circumstances, and at no time, have the Canaanites as servants, until the jubilee. Until Messiah shall come and put away typical things—even the jubilee and the typical servitude itself, your servants shall be of the *heathen around*, etc.

If the phrase *forever* is here used to define the time of service, it means until the jubilee. If it defines the duration of this statute, (and it is thus used with great frequency) it means throughout the whole of the Mosaic dispensation. *Forever* always means *throughout the term*. Sometimes it means eternity; and some times defined portions of time. The slaveholder's theory, that the phrase here means *for life*, is utterly inadmissible. We shall notice only two objections; and those are insuperable. Forever is *never* used in the law of Moses to signify a man's life-time—*never*, unless it can

be proved that it is so used here. And such an interpretation contradicts the very letter of the law. The trumpet of the jubilee was to *proclaim liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants of the land*. If it did not release the Gentile servants it released nobody, as they were the only servants whose freedom was not otherwise provided for.

The privileges which these Gentiles enjoyed under the typical masters were both types and pledges of those which believing Gentiles should enjoy in New Testament times. It was necessary the church should have some pledges. That Jesus will save every sinner throughout the world who believes on him, as readily as the Jew, is to us a very plain truth. We find no difficulty in admitting it as an article in our creed. We never were taught to believe otherwise. But in the days of our Lord and his apostles it was different. From their infancy they had been taught by parents and teachers, that the Jews were always to be the peculiar people, and the Gentiles accursed. So deeply rooted in their minds was this principle, that Paul classes the fact, that Jesus was "preached to the Gentiles and believed on in

the world," with those great mysteries, his incarnation and resurrection from the dead. The baptism of Cornelius, an uncircumcised Gentile occasioned a great uproar throughout the churches. The Pharisees and the lawyers under the preaching of our Lord and John the Baptist perpetually quieted their fears of the wrath of God by persuading themselves that Messiah would be under the necessity of receiving the Jews only into his kingdom. He who knows the end from the beginning, was at pains by plain declarations and promises in the writings of his prophets, and by typical institutions in the law of Moses, to hold up clearly the truth that in Messiah all nations were to be blessed. Such facts as the repentance of Ninevah under the preaching of a Jewish prophet and the reception of the Queen of Sheba, and others, who came from far countries to hear the way of salvation; the fact that the temple was an house of prayer for all people and the institution of a typical servitude for strangers were proofs not only that God will save the Gentiles who trust in him, but they were presages of the unlimited extension of Messiah's blessings among all nations.

4. The relation of master and servant was founded on the atonement. This is clearly implied in the command, "Ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you to inherit them for a possession." We have noticed already that, according to the Bible use of the terms *inheritance and possession*, they mean that which is the gift of God through the blood of an atoning sacrifice, and which is thereby secured to its possessor. Not only that generation which received the law at Mount Sinai, but their children through every age *forever*, were to consider the privileges which the landholder and pious strangers enjoyed of entering into engagements to each other as masters and servants, as one of the typical fruits of the typical atonement. Thus they were taught that no Gentile sinner can become a servant of Jesus Christ; and Jesus can become the master of no sinner, but through the shedding of his blood to make atonement for their sins. "For to this end Christ died and rose and revived that he might be *Lord* both of the dead and the living." Rom. xiv, 9. It was not necessary that he should die to be the *Lord* in the common acceptation of the phrase.

As God it belonged to him to uphold and govern and finally judge all mankind. But to be the *master* as the term (*Kurios*) here means, to do for sinners all that was typified by the *master* in Israel, it was necessary that he should die and rise and live again. When Peter was preaching in the house of Cornelius the truth seems to have clearly flashed upon his mind for the first time, that "God is no respecter of persons," and that "Jesus is *master* (or Lord) of all," both Jew and Gentile. He had clearly understood, long before, that if a *Jew* fears God and works righteousness he is accepted; and that Jesus Christ will satisfy all the demands of God's law against the *believing Jew*, and will take him into his house and feed, and clothe, and protect, and do for him all that is implied in the title *master*. But that the Gentile can be accepted without circumcision and that Jesus can be *his* master was new to him. His ignorance however on this subject is no more proof that this truth had not been clearly held up in the ordinance of the jubilee, than his ignorance of the extent of his kingdom proved that Jesus had never said, "go ye into all the world; preach

the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved. But he that believeth not shall be damned."

X. In conclusion, we invite attention to the following remarks:

1. We see the guilt of those who quote the ordinance of the jubilee in defense of the slave-trade or slaveholding. It was one of those institutions before the coming of Christ, by which substantially the same truths were exhibited, which are now symbolized in the ordinance of the Lord's supper. It was in reference to such feasts as that on the morning of the atonement every year, and every fifteenth year, that David says, "I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the house of the Lord." It was on account of the soul-cheering discoveries which such ordinance afforded, of the love of God and of the riches of the grace which he has in store for a perishing world, that he declares, "a day in thy courts excels a thousand; I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness." It was a part of that law which God gave his church for the purpose of making them holy, and on

which they delighted in meditating day and night; and which they admired for its purity, just in proportion to their preparation for heaven.

To perceive the criminality of making such an ordinance a prop to the slave-system, it is not necessary to go into a detail of the evils of such a system. No tongue can tell the miseries which Africa has been enduring for upward of four hundred years. The soul would sicken at the most summary detail of the horrors of the middle passage; yet the *jubilee* is the proof that the trade was approved by the God of heaven. The permission to *buy bondmen of the heathen round about*, is the charm which quiets the consciences of Christians, and ministers of the Gospel, and drunkards, and whoremongers, and gamblers, in view of the shocking cruelties of the slave-trade in our own land. *The jubilee statute* is the Scripture proof which, in the house of God, and on the race turf, and in our legislative halls, and in our civil and ecclesiastical courts, silences objections to law for forcibly depriving nearly four millions of strangers of their natural rights, and of the

means of salvation, and for punishing with whipping and even death those who would dare to enlighten them, or do any thing calculated to make them dissatisfied with their horrible condition. It is not necessary to enumerate the evils of slavery as it exists among us: the day of judgment, the day which shall *bring to light the hidden things of darkness* and that day only will fully disclose them. The simple fact that the jubilee was one of the holy ordinances for bringing sinners to Christ, shows the damning guilt of those who would prostitute it to any other purpose. The mind of man can not conceive of any species of witchcraft more horrible. Balaam is called a *sorcerer* because he prostituted sacrifices and other ordinances to making money. And all who use the jubilee as a prop to slavery are *sorcerers*.

2. In the use which is made of the jubilee and other ordinances of the Old Testament for the defense of slavery, we see one cause of many of the evils with which we are afflicted. We have not yet reached that atheism which traces evils no further than to second causes. "Shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not

done it." By *evils* we do not mean afflictive dispensations only.

We have brought the word of God into contempt. It could not be otherwise. How could men of reflection persuade themselves that while the Old Testament encourages slave-making wars, and making merchandise of immortal beings, it is a holy book? To persuade their children to love the sermons of our Lord, and the writings of his apostles, they were under the necessity of telling them that they inculcated a more pure morality than Moses and the prophets, and the book of psalms. Thus the word of God is charged with impurity, inconsistency and self-contradiction; a charge which has doomed the productions of impostors to deserved and everlasting contempt. That the Old Testament is less pure than the New, is one of the dogmas of most of the churches in our slaveholding nation. The sum of the instruction which our young men receive from most of our theological professors, respecting the Sinai covenant is, that it is impure, when brought to the light of the New Testament; and the proof generally is such glaring falsehoods as that it licensed polygamy and slaveholding; and then follow some profane and

foolish anecdotes, to deter young men from attempting to find in it the gospel which Jesus and his apostles preached.

Thus the Old Testament has ceased to be used in ascertaining the meaning of the terms employed in the New Testament to express the offices and blessings of the Savior; and the writings of pagans, and the customs of the most filthy nations, are substituted in its room. This is the course pursued by theologians of every school. Instead of inquiring how the prophets understood, from the beginning, such terms as master, redeemer, intercessor, etc., they consult some pagan seer, like Homer, or Lucian, or introduce the reader to the temple of some pagan deity, that he may there see how things are in the house of God. If an angel from heaven were to come down and expound the Scriptures according to this principle of interpretation, he would necessarily preach heresy. If all the judicatories of the several churches were to sweep out all the errors now among them, they would have to perform the same work the next year, unless ministers would cease from expounding the Scriptures or bring back the correct principle of interpretation.

To help the statute of the jubilee in supporting slavery, a long list of heresies have been introduced into the church as sound theology.

Doing well that good may come, is not peculiar to papists. Those ministers and church members who most loudly reprobate the principle of slavery because it violates the law of God, justily themselves in the practice of it, by detailing the evils they are thereby averting from their country, and the good they are doing to the enslaved and their own families,

It has introduced a kind of *expediency* unknown to our fathers, and at war with the law of God. The expediency recognised by the Scriptures is abstaining from things lawful in themselves, lest owing to circumstances they should prove he occasions of sin. 1 Cor. viii, 13. But the expediency of the present day is disobeying God, lest obeying him should do harm. In other words, it is serving the devil, when serving God would be attended with great inconvenience.

Immediately forsaking sin, has ceased to be considered as necessary evidence of genuine repentance. There are in the church scores of ministers, and thousands of members, who, in

the same breath with which they ask pardon for the sin of slaveholding, must also plead for the Divine blessing on their perseverance in it a little longer. The only way in which they can escape such absurdity is, by keeping that subject entirely out of their devotional exercises.* We suspect that a heresy so frightful as that *we may continue in the practice of a sin of which*

*In this way they generally manage. But when they feel the heavy hand of death upon them, they can not always succeed in banishing it. Hence we hear of death bed emancipations, and they are often announced as decisive evidence that the deceased has gone to heaven. Such evidences of piety remind us of the case in which the priest refused to give the sick man absolution, because he would not forgive one of his neighbors; "Well, I'll just tell your reverence what I'll do now; if I die, I'll forgive him, and if I live I won't." We would be charged with slandering a priest, were we to say he was satisfied. Yet they would have us believe that the Almighty considers it true repentance when the slave master knowing that he has only 'two or three breaths to draw, raises the scream, and consents to let go. And his having come to this resolution, "If I die, I'll cease to be a slaveholder, and if I live, I won't," will be proclaimed over his grave by the man who preaches his funeral, as comfortable evidence that he died a Christian.

we have repented, never did gain admission into the church, excepting as a prop to some system of abomination like slaveholding.

Buying and holding property known to be stolen, has ceased to be considered unchristian. A minister will come down from the scaffold from which the slaver has been swung off, and step into the pulpit to address a congregation, who have made their fortunes by hiring slavers to bring them human cattle from Africa. And while he preaches that the slaver ought to be hanged, he will address them as *holy and beloved brethren*.

Protestants and papists have shaken hands over the heresy, that permitting common people to read the Scriptures is dangerous, and *oral instruction* is sufficient. But their reasons are different. There is something like piety in the papist's apology, "ignorance will make them more devout." But ours is purely devilish; if we permit them to be enlightened by the word of God, we can not use them as brutes.

Urging repentance of sins which are popular in the church and the world is considered *unfriendly to revivals*! A large and influential synod, in a late report on the state of religion,

accounted for the want of revivals within their bounds by stating that some of their members had become abolitionists; plainly intimating that those who would rebuke their neighbors and not suffer the sin of oppression upon them, are the Jonahs who must be thrown overboard, that those who are unwilling to repent, may enjoy the smiles of heaven. If that venerable synod were sound casuists, those who whipped and crucified the apostles, for disturbing them in their favorite sins, were the revivalists; and those who preached, "repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the time of refreshing shall come from the Lord," were the cold hearted professors, and enemies to revivals.

It is becoming a part of our practical theology that we must abstain from those discussions which occasion excitement. Of course the apostles were indiscreet when they touched the exciting subject of idolatry. The prudent course for a minister is, not to consult his commission and instructions from the master—but, to ascertain how far the devil and his angels will permit him to go without an uproar, and act accordingly. Show us a minister whose

course occasions no excitement, and deliberately shuns every subject calculated to excite the wicked, and we will show a man who is on good terms with the destroyer. The enemy of souls may *despise* him, but *he can not hate him*. Yet many ministers of the gospel declare, not only as individuals, but in ecclesiastical bodies, constituted in the name and by the authority of the head of the church, that slavery shall not be discussed; and if the higher judicatories permit the discussion, they will secede.*

They so resolve, not because they consider it a subject of no importance. They know that slavery is bringing ruin on our church and nation. The very name of *slaveholding republican America* is becoming a taunt and a by-word among the despots of Europe. What will be the influence of our nation on the cause of liberty in foreign climes; and what will be the reception of our missionaries when they have to introduce themselves as from the only

*In other words, though they mean not so, they will be guilty of the sin of schism. Separating from a church of Christ, while we are permitted to think, and speak, and act, is *schism*.

Christian nation that patronizes slavery—from the land where with one hand they sign declarations that *all men are born free and equal*, and in the other brandish the cart whip over millions of affrighted slaves? They tell us, the prosperity of our church and nation forbid us to discuss the subject of slavery. They know that a cloud of wrath hangs over us for this sin. If they believe that God regards his own threatenings against oppression, they know that the cries of more than three millions of strangers, and widows, and fatherless children, are not ascending daily to heaven in vain. We all know that the system under which they are held, while it afflicts their bodies, kills their souls. It interferes with all the relations which God has constituted. It forbids the slave to worship God, unless his master and mistress please. It forbids him, under pain of heavy lashes on his bare back, to use the means of knowing how he may worship aright, or how his soul may be redeemed from sin and wrath. It forbids him to sanctify the Sabbath, and requires him to profane it, if a fellow-worm desire it. It puts the veto on God's command to parents, to bring up their children in the

nurture and admonition of the Lord; and forbids children to honor their parents. It annihilates the marriage institution, and converts every slave State into a great brothel. Yet slavery must not be discussed!

They know too that unless this will soon be put away, our white slaves will soon outnumber the blacks. We have seen the title *the white slaves*, applied by one of our popular journals to the abolitionists. And truly the title is appropriate. It means that class whose societies for combined operation will soon number thousands, among whom it would be difficult to find a drunkard or a swearer; but whose crime is believing, and saying, and *proving* that the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is universal and inalienable. Whether they shall enjoy the semblance of freedom, or soon be reduced to a slavery as humiliating and oppressive as that of their colored brethren is not yet decided. High-handed measures are in operation to deprive them of some of their dearest rights—rights given to them by God, and guaranteed by the constitution and laws of the land. Governors and legislators, and “men of standing and

property," in obedience to the nod of southern despots; and through the instrumentality of mobs of their own getting up, in open and scandalous violation of the law, are exerting themselves to put down the freedom of speech and the press. If an abolitionist sets his feet within a slave State, he must either meanly suppress his sentiments in regard to human rights, or calculate on surrendering his life to a brutal, *legalized mob*. In every State their property and lives are in jeopardy; their houses have been broken open at midnight; their churches have been demolished; they have been mobbed, stoned, and publicly whipped in the market places.

Unless the present course of things can be arrested, the term *white slaves*, will not be sufficient to express their condition. Yet slavery must not be discussed! Ministers and church judicatories tell us, unless we quietly submit, they will secede. And even some who think correctly on the question of slavery, are clamorous that we should be silent, lest these dear brethren should put their threats into execution. Let us see whether such advisers can be consistent with their own

principles, or look at such advice without being shocked. Wicked men to compel their wives to leave church and apostatize from their profession, have threatened to hang themselves. At the commencement of the temperance reformation, every bloated face in the church, put on great concern for the interests of religion, advising ministers to be prudent, and threatening them that if they touched that *delicate subject*, they would secede. And now slaveholders are trying the same experiment. The grave question is, What should Christians do in such circumstances? When wicked men threaten to hang themselves, and drunkards and slaveholders threaten to leave us, and establish drunken churches, and slaveholding churches, what should Christians do? While we say to our threatening brethren, "do yourselves no harm," we also say that a speedier method of bringing slaveholding to an end, could not be devised, than the erection of churches on the broad principle that making merchandise of God's image is a Christian privilege. A church with such a Gorgon head, would frighten any pious man in the neighborhood, to the free States. Men of the world

would have too much sense to seek the gracious presence of the God of mercy, in such an establishment. The ministers would fare as ministers generally fare when they step forward with their Bibles to help slaveholders out of the pinch in defending slaveholding. He would receive, at the moment, abundance of thanks, but as soon as that pinch was forgotten, abundance of contempt. Slaveholders are advocates for holding slaves, and getting rich and for high living. But they are willing to do all that themselves. They like to see the minister a plain, pious, honest man. Ministers from the East have, by marriage, become extensive slaveholders, and turned zealous advocates for the doctrine, that holding property in man, is a divine institution. And in most of the southern States there are such ministers deserted and despised—turned into pillars of salt by the hand of God, as warnings to other missionaries not to barter the favor of heaven for lucre, and the applause of a slaveholding community.

We sincerely believe that the sin of slavery is at the root of all the difficulties under which most of the churches are at present laboring. There is a great cry about error and heresy.

But what heresy worse, either in theory or practice, than manstealing? And it can be shown that every heresy and error, maintained by any of the schools, into which we are divided, has grown out of, or is supported by, some false principles of Scripture interpretation used every day in the defense of slaveholding.

3. We see the obligations which all Christians and patriots are under, to employ their influence for the removal of this sin. It is painful to hear a Christian say, "I never owned slaves, and have, therefore, nothing to do with this matter." He is inexcusably ignorant, who does not know that every sin winked at by any nation, is a national sin, and that God holds every man as a slaver in the guilt of that sin, who does not protest and use his influence against it. The reason why judgment generally begins at the house of God, is, that no sin can extensively prevail in any Christian land, unless it be countenanced by the church. If church judicatories and church members would purify themselves, the evil would soon be banished.

We are urged to the duty before us, by every consideration which moves a Christian. Do

you love God? Do you love your country? Do you hate sin? Have you any pity for the souls of oppressors? any sympathy for the oppressed? God says, "thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him." God says, "open thy mouth for the dumb, in the cause of all such as are appointed for destruction. Open thy mouth, and judge righteously, and plead the cause of the poor and needy." Many of them are those whom our Savior calls *his little ones*, and he cheers you to the good work, by the assurance that when he shall come in the glory of his Father, and his holy angels with him, every expression of kindness to them shall be acknowledged as done to himself, and rewarded accordingly.

4. Encouragements to perseverance in bringing the word of God to bear on the consciences and hearts of slaveholders and others. It is a cheering fact, that although there are at present many hundreds of anti-slavery societies, composed of every religious and political creed, we have not heard of resort to violence, in a single instance.* Under the most trying treatment,

* It is not difficult to foresee the disgrace and ruin which they would bring on their cause by resort to vio-

they have been enabled to imitate, in some degree the example of him of whom it was written, "he shall not strive, nor cry, neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets." Arguments addressed to the understanding of slaveholders, and especially, arguments drawn from the word of God have been their weapons. The success which has already attended the course pursued is encouraging. They have roused the whole nation to the investigation of the subject. They have compelled the enemies of freedom to show their colors. In the con-

lence. There was a mighty cry among the pro-slavery editors when the false report was heard, that the man who stabbed another in self-defense, at a religious meeting in Missouri, was an abolitionist. It was represented as a call upon the community to rise *en masse*, and destroy the fanatics. But when the stabber turned out to be, not an abolitionist, but colonizationist, those same editors were silent as the grave. We have another reason for discountenancing violence. Those men, who are now training mobs, are nourishing the serpent which will bite themselves. Those who compose mobs, are men of no principle—the mere hangers on in society. As soon as their eyes are opened to the true spirit of slaveholding, and as soon as abolition becomes popular, they will wish to claim kindred with the other side. Every good man therefore should set his face, as a flint, against violence in every quarter.

tempt which the apologists for slavery have manifested in their writings and speeches, for the working class, in the encouragement they have given to violent and illegal proceedings, and in the disposition they have discovered to penal enactments to suppress the liberty of speech and of the press, they have shown what is the true spirit of slaveholding. By bringing the word of God to bear against this sin, abolitionists have compelled their opponents to abandon their refuge of lies behind which they had entrenched themselves for centuries, viz: "Slavery is a sin, but we are compelled by necessity to persevere; or, slavery is contrary to the law of God, but it is approved by the Old Testament." They have been compelled to change their ground, and to contend that both in principle and in practice it is justified by both the Old and New Testament. By the sword of the spirit, they have been driven to the open field, where the battle will be of short duration. The mass of slaveholding theologians have been silenced. They generally declare that they will discuss the subject no longer. In the meantime there is a cry among them for the professors in our theological seminaries to take

the field. Three of these professors have girded on the harness. They have commenced by acknowledging that if slavery be a sin it ought to be abandoned immediately. But they are going to show that the word of God approves it. Of course, whether they know it or not, they are going to fight, not with abolitionist, but with God in heaven. They are undertaking to strip him of that character in which he glories. *The Lord executeth righteousness and judgment for all them that are oppressed.* They are going to prove before the universe that he is the great patron of slavery ! What will be the result, it requires no spirit of prophecy to predict. If the sons of Levi would blow the silver trumpet of a whole piece, and give distinct sounds, and if the people would cry unto the Lord, they would soon have occasion for the song of the triumph, *sing ye unto the Lord for he hath triumphed gloriously.*

THE END.